

HOBSON AGAINST DUVALL!

THE UNION
AGAINST SECESSION!

READ AND REASON!

READ and CIRCULATE!

READ BEFORE YOU VOTE!

JOURNAL OFFICE
LOUISVILLE, KY.
1866.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

UNION VERSUS SECESSION.

The present state of political affairs in this State is one of great interest not only to its citizens, but to the country at large. It is justly regarded by all Union men as a contest between Union and Disunion, Patriotism against Secession. Stripped of all disguises and reduced to its elementary principles, it amounts to just that. The Secessionists of Kentucky are making another stand for their old faith and practices. They do not, of course, openly avow this—at least their leaders do not—but they might as well do it. Their acts plainly show it, and but for the sake of policy, but for the hope of catching Union votes, there is no reason to doubt that those leaders would *now* boldly declare their sympathies for the late attempt to disrupt the Union, regret its failure and the triumph of the Union cause. Under these circumstances, the struggle is of great significance, and, though the only State election is for Clerk of the Court of Appeals, becomes really national in its character, and must have an important bearing upon the question of reconciliation and our future peace. We feel, therefore, justified in giving, and, indeed, imperiously called upon by a profound sense of duty to give, the subject that attention which its great practical importance and bearings demand at our hands.

We premise by saying that the contest is not of our making. The Union men of Kentucky, who have upheld the glorious flag of their country in the council, through the press, on the rostrum, and the field through many a terrible struggle, desired no such issue. They wanted peace, Union, and fraternity. They wanted to make the past a sealed book, and to cast over it the pall of everlasting oblivion. They desired harmony. They longed, they prayed for a Union completely restored, and a land once more a great national Brotherhood. The expatriation laws which the Legislature of Kentucky felt called upon to enact in the dark days of the Republic were repealed in the interests of good feelings and the desire to remove all causes of discord and irritation. Many Union men, it is true, thought this premature, and that such repeal would be attended with unhappy consequences. But, if an error was made, it was an error in favor of generosity and magnanimity. It was an error, if error at all, of the head and not of the heart. The intention by the repeal was *not* to justify the revolt, but to reconcile and to unite all classes, to do

something to pave the way for that good time to which we have been all looking forward, the great golden period of universal peace and a hearty reunion among all the people of this great country.

Such, we say, were the intentions, the wishes, and such the *animus* of the Union men of Kentucky at the time of the collapse of the revolt for the dissolution of the Union and the extirpation of republican-democratic principles in this country.

Hardly had the smoke of the battles cleared away, however, before the old enemies of the Union, those who had helped to bring on the war against the Government, and who had tried to coerce Kentucky into an attitude of hostility to the Government, to force her to shoot madly from her sphere of active patriotism, Union, and order, into the dark abyss of revolution, anarchy, and the nameless horrors which subsequently came upon thousands of our people began their agitation and their machinations for the creation of a Party of Reaction, or, in plain words, for the reorganization of the old Secession Party of Kentucky and the South. We believe that the honest Confederate soldiers, those who had actually fought in the Confederate armies as private soldiers or subordinate officers, had very little to do with the inauguration of the movement. We think they really wanted peace. There were, of course, exceptions to this, but we think this was a fact as a rule. The movement was set on foot by old Secession politicians and Secession editors, who thought they could, by playing upon the prejudices and passions of the unthinking and lawless, obtain power and the complete control of this State, and form a nucleus around which Secession in other States might rally its adherents, and through the influence of which it might, at some future suitable period, again attempt to accomplish its dark and traitorous purposes. The real aims of the leaders of this reactionary organization cannot be mistaken by any one who carefully notes their actions, what they say, and *what they carefully abstain from saying*. This last is, perhaps, with many of them, more significant than their open avowals.

Having determined upon another rally in favor of Secession principles, having determined *not* to unite with the mass of their Union fellow-citizens in sustaining the Government and the policy of restoration, they began to pull the wires for a convention, which assembled in this city on the 1st of May for the purpose of perfecting their organization and nominating a candidate for Clerk of the Appellate Court. Before this convention met, almost the only person talked of for that office was a man who had been one of John Morgan's raiders upon the loyal people of this State—who robbed banks, tore up railroads, plundered villages, and stole horses, and who would have been delighted to see all the towns and villages of Kentucky in a blaze from the mountains to the rivers. There was a general cry of indignation at the audacity of such an act, at its absolute indecency and effrontery, and the leaders quailed before the storm which they foresaw would rise if they dared thus to insult the loyal people of the State, and a candidate in full commu-

nion with Morgan and his cause took the place which the leaders had no the courage to fill with the name they really wanted.

When the

CONVENTION OF THE FIRST OF MAY

met, it was found to be composed exclusively of those who had given the revolt either active or tacit aid and support. There was hardly an original Union man in it. It was emphatically

A CONVENTION OF SECESSIONISTS,

who did what they could during 1860 to bring on the war for the destruction of the Government, and who, while that war lasted, did their utmost to make it effectual in dissolving the Union of our Fathers. Now, if those Secessionists semi-Secessionists, and Secession sympathizers, aiders, and raiders, who notoriously and undeniably had been such, had renounced their theories and their practices, if they had resolved hereafter to become devoted to the Government and the Union, as, in the language of the Indiana Democracy, "the only test of political orthodoxy", a plain, honest man would at once declare that they would have said so in unmistakable terms. Did they do that? Did they renounce Secession in explicit terms? Did they do it even indirectly and by fair implication? No, they did not. They entirely ignored any direct allusion to the pivotal, vital question of the whole war, and referred to it indirectly only to affirm the doctrine of Secession, as we shall presently prove. They found room for almost everything else. They put forth a string of platitudes and commonplaces, but not a word in direct reference to the dreadful overwhelming issue which had devastated the land with fire and slaughter; which had filled it with groans and tears, with widows and orphans; which had dug a million of graves, and jeopardized the very existence of republican institutions. They did not repudiate Secession, the work of their hands. On the contrary, they left us to infer that they approve of it, or rather they so worded their resolutions as indirectly to reiterate their old Secession opinions, and they must, consequently, indorse the results of them. Their first resolution opens thus oracularly and *darkly*:

"1. Whereas, In all republics, after the convulsions of revolution, when the storm of passion has subsided, and reason has been allowed again to give utterance to the words of immutable truth and justice, it has been deemed proper to pause and assert the true principles of government."

We should think it would be much more "proper" "in all republics" "to pause and assert the true principles of government" *before* the "convulsions of revolution," *before* the "storm of passion" had been lashed into such a tempest as Secession brought directly upon this country, at the time so peaceful, so happy, so prosperous, and so powerful. But did not these Secessionists of the First of May Convention, and do they not *now*, contend that *they did* "assert the true principles of" *our* Government when they decided to dissolve the Union and coerce Kentucky out of it? We appeal to any honest intelligent man in the State, whether Unionist or Disunionist, if the Secession

Democracy have not always contended that "the true principles of" our Government justify Secession by a State whenever it thinks proper to secede? Instead of denying the principles of Secession, therefore, the leaders of the Convention expressly, though covertly, insidiously, and most adroitly, "assert" them! Yes, they do "assert" them and reassert them *after* the war, after the attempt to carry out the said "true principles" of our Government as Secessionists have construed them. They are "allowed AGAIN to give utterance to the words of *immutable* truth and justice." Were they right five years ago in beginning the war for the dissolution of the Union? They said *then* that they were, they do not deny it now, and they "assert" that the "words of truth and justice" are "immutable"; that is, unchangeable. They reassert, therefore, the

PRINCIPLES OF SECESSION

in the very first words of their resolutions, assert them in the face and eyes of the loyal men of Kentucky and of the whole country! Unless they take the ground that the "words of immutable truth and justice" and the "true principles" of our Government did *not* justify Secession, then, by the "immutable" force of logic, do they now by their words reassert and rejustify Secession. This is what we charge upon them, and have repeatedly charged upon them before; and *they have not* denied, and *do not*, and, in our judgment, *will not* and *dare not* deny it! Let them deny it, and we will cheerfully and gladly give them the benefit of the denial. We want them to deny it. Nothing would give us greater pleasure than to believe that they have heartily and explicitly repudiated and forever abandoned the *principle of Secession*.

As their resolutions stand, their first words justify and "assert" that principle. They may wriggle till they are weary, and wag their tongues till they drop out of their mouths, yet they cannot escape the conclusion which their words force upon them unless they deny that the "true principles", the "words of *immutable* truth and justice", sustain Secession. Truly, "out of the fullness of the heart the mouth speaketh." They were so full of Secession that they blurted it out—though, as they thought, so covered up that the people would not perceive it—in the first sentences of their nineteen resolutions, and nowhere subsequently denied the doctrine or said a word against it! Their *second* resolution begins thus:

2. We most solemnly declare a warm attachment to the Union of the States, under and pursuant to the Constitution, by the adoption of which the Union was effected; and we know of no better or more effectual way of maintaining and perpetuating the Union than by upholding and defending the Constitution, which is the bond of Union, by a faithful observance of the principles upon which the Union is based.

There is not a word in that which is inconsistent with what the Secessionists said in 1860 while plotting the destruction of that very Union and that Constitution. They said that they were in favor of the Constitution, but that the "principles upon which the Union was based" had been violated, and

that *that* justified them in resorting to a forcible dissolution of it. They said in 1860 that they were perfectly willing to have the Union, provided there should be a due "observance" of the Constitution, of which *they* were to be the exclusive judges. They "observe" still the old Secession platitudes, talk still in their roundabout way of the Constitution and the Union, and profess to favor them, *provided* all their whims are humored, just as they did six years ago. We heard the late W. L. Yancey, of Alabama, deliver an elaborate speech during that ever-memorable campaign, in which he put forth just such sentiments as are embodied in the above extract. "Elect Mr. Breckinridge," he said, "and we will still remain in the Union." Elect us, and it will be all right. Keep us in office, comply with all our caprices, let us have all the Government plunder, let us rule, and we have no sort of objection to the Union. But if you don't do this, we'll "shatter it from the dome to its foundation stones."

Their third resolution commences in this way:

3. We declare that the Federal Government is one of limited and restricted powers, and that it has no authority whatever to exercise any power not specifically enumerated and authorized by the Constitution.

Is it possible, Messrs. Conventionists, that you declare that? Why, surely, Monsieur Tonson has come again! We have heard of such declarations before. In 1860 they were as plenty as blackberries in May or June or July. The "Federal Government is one of limited and restricted powers," it had and has no right to keep a State from going out of the Union, to prevent it from breaking up and destroying the said Government, and therefore every attempt to do this, every effort to preserve the Union, is a violation of these "limited powers" and a great outrage that ought to be resisted by force and by all the power a *State* can bring to bear against it. If the Government exercises an "authority" which, in the opinion of Secessionists, violates the "limited and restricted powers" with which it is invested, what then, oh ye frank immaculates? When then? Secede, won't you? Isn't Secession the rightful remedy, the measure and mode of redress for all State grievances, real or fancied? Further along in the resolutions we find this:

We declare that the Federal Government has no right whatever to abridge or interfere with the freedom of speech or the press.

Ye gods! how like a grim and dismal joke that sounds coming from Secessionists just from the Confederacy! To those who recollect how much "freedom of speech or of the press" there was in Dixie, the declaration is specially refreshing and unctuous. Wherefore, oh ye Conventionists, did you omit a declaration in favor of the conscription laws and the blood-hounds? Aren't you in favor of the largest *liberty* (!) in these interesting particulars? What champions of freedom you have been!

But space forbids us to follow these sinister resolutions of the First of May Convention to their dreary end. They are all pitched to the same key.

Their authors are all in favor of *freedom* now—for themselves at least. They are the very souls of liberty—for all Secessionists want the right to do just as they please, want the Government to be duly restricted and confined within the narrowest possible compass. They have suddenly become shocked at any attempt to violate the Constitution, and proceed to arraign the *Radicals* in good set phrase for their diabolical wickedness! One would suppose these precious Secessionists had been straining themselves to their utmost capacity to protect the Constitution from violence and the Union from desecration! What an innocent face they put on, and how remarkably *conservative* (?) all at once they have become! Their denunciations are all directed to one class of *Radicals*, however. For the other class, for Secession Radicals, for the most ultra practical Radicals the country ever had, they haven't a word of condemnation. Those who laid violent hands upon the citadel of our liberties and attempted to overturn it and reduce it to a chaotic mass of ruins, these First-of-May-Conventionists treat as tenderly as new-born babes. Not a whisper against Southern Secession Radicals; not a syllable in opposition to the John Morgan Radicals and raiders who devastated Kentucky! They, the most bigoted, proscriptive, and uncompromising Radicals in the whole country, talk of radicalism! They who did their worst to destroy the Constitution prate about its violations and its violators!

We must not take leave of these resolutions without noticing the stab they give to the credit and good faith of our Government. Let the reader carefully note the following jesuitical and dmagogical extract:

That we regard the exemption from taxation of what are called Government securities constituting as they do a vast amount of the property of the nation, as an unjust and odious discrimination in favor of the rich against the poor, of the capitalist against the laborer, and of the moneyed aristocracy against the industrial classes of the country.

That's a repudiation of faith sacredly pledged, which the Government cannot violate without covering itself with infamy. Yet these Secession leaders take ground in favor of that very infamy. They ask the Government to do violence to its most solemn pledges. The Government, in order to induce the *people*—of every class, rich or poor—to purchase its securities, expressly provided by law that they should not be taxed. These Secession leaders of Kentucky want the Government to prove false to its plighted faith and swindle its creditors! Oh, honest and law-abiding, constitutional Patriots! How you do “support the Government!”

The spirit that dictated the above

REPUDIATES THE NATIONAL DEBT,
and some of those actively engaged in sustaining this
SECESSION PARTY OF KENTUCKY,
openly urged such

REPUDIATION
upon the people of this State. One of them, in a letter, a few days ago, said,
“*Urge the Repudiation of the National Debt.*” That is what this shame-

less avowal means. Let Duvall and this SECESSION PARTY be victorious in this contest, and it will be received everywhere as the triumph of repudiation, and every loyal man in the country will take the alarm, the President's policy will be crushed, and the States of the South kept in the unnatural condition in which they are now.

The Union men of Kentucky emblazon upon their banners GOOD FAITH, scrupulous fidelity to every obligation of the Government, no perfidy,

NO REPUDIATION,

no stabbing the public credit, no demagoguery, no agrarianism, *no arraying the poor against the rich; no secret hostility to the Union under deceitful pretexts; no disguising or "keeping the promise to the ear but breaking it to the hope."*

If the First-of-May-Conventionists counsel the repudiation of the interest or a part of it, on the Public Debt, they thereby repudiate a part of the debt itself; and if they can do that they can repudiate the whole of it. There is no difference in the principle. He who attempts to avoid the payment of the *interest* of his note would also attempt to avoid the payment of the principal. Is it not so? These Conventionists thus come before the voters of Kentucky indorsing the repudiation of the interest on the public debt, and the principle of repudiating the debt itself, at the same time that they carefully avoid denying the doctrine of Secession. They probably mean to evade the entire principle of the mighty issue which has convulsed the country during so many long and bloody and agonizing years; but Secession has become so interwoven with their very nature that they have really "asserted" it in the first resolution that they adopted, and we invite them to get out of it if they can. Their banner is

SECESSION AND REPUDIATION,

twin works of iniquity and enemies of the people of the United States.

The advocates of this Radical Party of Reaction call themselves the "Democratic" Party. Names signify little; but we can not help remembering that Secession was attempted in the South under this very name. "State Rights Democracy" was every where the rallying cry of those who tried to dismember the Union. The Breckinridge faction of 1860 was the "Democratic" Party, so-called; and that same "Democratic Party" went out of the Union, according to the asseverations of its accredited agents, and declared that institution dissolved. We now find the leaders and abettors of this "Democratic" Party in the South with the same name, and substantially, if not technically, the same professions and principles, again trying to get power, "*again*" "asserting" their old tenets, sometimes skillfully concealed and cunningly mixed up with doctrines which no one denies, and other times boldly and brazenly and impudently avowed; and we therefore naturally infer that it is the same old guilty faction that has so cursed the country by its perfidy and its treason.

The leading organ of the faction in this city on the 21st of May last described it—in an unguarded moment, of course—as the “rebel Democracy”, and we suppose that the organ understands its party, and shall not therefore question the propriety of the name it selected.

Let it not be thought that there is no such thing as a Secession Party now in existence. There is? Such a Party or faction is yet living and acting in the North, and has friends in the South, though they do not now avow it. Its principal strength, however, at the present time is in this State, and it is struggling desperately for the ascendancy. The men who tried to coerce Kentucky out of the Union are supporting it. This faction is bitterly hostile to the Union. In the view of its advocates, the only right which the Union has is the right to self-destruction. They believe it is in duty bound either to commit suicide or let others destroy it. In States north of the Ohio some of them take open ground *now* in favor of Secession! We are not using words at random, and we shall prove what we say beyond the power of successful contradiction. These outspoken Secessionists—who are in active sympathy with the Duvall Radicals of Kentucky—have two or three little papers in Ohio, two or three in New York, three or four or half a dozen in the Northwest. They praise the First-of-May-Duvall-Radical-Reaction-Secession-“Democratic” Party here with great uncton and much fellow-feeling. They have a friend in Congress, Mr. Benjamin G. Harris, of “My Maryland,” and several prominent friends out of it. They will of course be grateful to us for giving further publicity to their views and *patriotism*. Mr. Harris has lately delivered a speech, and one of the Ohio organs of the Party publishes it, with a eulogium beginning as follows :

MR. HARRIS'S DEMOCRACY.—Our readers need not be requested to read every line of Mr. Harris's great SECESSION speech in Congress. Lamartine once said of an effort of Michel de Bourges, in the tribune of the French National Assembly, that it was more than a discourse—it was a European event. We say the same thing of this TRUE and seasonable DEMOCRATIC speech of Mr. Harris.

Thus unqualifiedly indorsed by this “Democratic” paper of Ohio, that is giving all the possible comfort to the Duvall Party of Kentucky, let us turn to the speech itself and listen to the ring of its metal. We quote very briefly :

I am an Old-Line Democrat, and believe in the doctrine of Secession. I believe that the several States of the Union have a right to separate from it, each acting for itself. I believe that abuses and usurpations had been practiced and threatened to so great an extent by their associates and partners in this governmental compact that the Southern States were justified in going out; and, sir, I further believe, by their ordinances of secession, that they did go out, and thereby became to this Union foreign States.

From what I have said, Mr. Speaker, this House will readily infer that I am adverse to the reconstruction policy of the President. * * * In my view, the Southern seceded States have no right to representatives on this floor or in the Senate, and by my vote I have heretofore invariably rejected

every application which has been made by any person claiming such a right. And, sir, not only do I believe that they have no right in their present position to send Senators and Representatives here, but I do not think that they have the right to furnish us with a President or Vice-President, although there are many here and elsewhere who, while agreeing with me that these States are out of the Union and not entitled to representation anywhere, have been so fraternal in their feelings and so magnanimous in their conduct as to go beyond the line in order to obtain the services of the gentleman who at present fills the Executive chair of the United States. Being a citizen of seceded and unreconstructed Tennessee, he is, in my opinion, as also upon their theory, only President *de facto*, forced upon the country by their votes, attended by that very effective implement, their bayonets.

That will do as to Secession and "*Democracy*". Take a brief reference to the National Debt:

You will further urge that, in such a condition of things, they may repudiate the public debt. This your intelligent constituent will say is not a sufficient reason if true, because, if the people of this country, in a proper constitutional mode, shall declare that this debt shall not be paid, *they have the power to say so*; and it is not because the bonds are all held North that they should not have and exercise this right if they choose. It is not the only debt by several that the people have repudiated and are likely to repudiate. Besides, these bonds cost many who hold them a comparatively trifling sum.

He then suggests that by *increasing* the debt, that is, *adding the Confederate war debt to it*, both North and South might consent to pay it!!!

A word about Andrew Johnson:

I confess that Andrew Johnson has been, in adopting his mode of reconstruction, consistent with the views of the late President, with those of the Republican party that elected him, and with his own declaration from the time he abandoned the Democratic party and joined the Republicans. These facts do not commend him to me.

That will do for this "Democratic" speech and its "Democratic" author. Said we not truly that there is a Secession Party alive and active in the United States?

One of the New York organs of this "Democratic" Party thus indorses Mr. Harris's speech:

We publish the fine, manly speech of Judge Harris this week, and need not call attention to it, for no doubt our readers will find out its merits for themselves.

The abolition lunatics will probably denounce it as an argument in favor of the doctrine of Secession, and weak-kneed Democrats will pretend that it does not reflect the views of the "Democratic party"; but it tells such good, wholesome TRUTH, and squares so closely with the grand old Jefferson Democracy of 1793, that its publication will strengthen the weak and give courage even to the moral cowards who condemn it.

It is comfortable to know that there are yet one or two men among us that dare to go back to those sacred and fundamental principles of self-government so gloriously vindicated in 1776 by our fathers.

This "Democratic" Party takes for its platform the first Kentucky resolution of '98, which is in the following words:

Resolved, That the several States composing the United States are not united on the principle of unlimited submission to their General Government, but that by a compact, under the style and title of a Constitution for the United States, and of amendments thereto, they constitute a General Government for special purposes—delegated to that Government certain definite powers, reserving, each State to itself, the residuary mass of right to their self-government; and that whenever the General Government assumes undelegated power, its acts are unauthorized, void, and of no force; that to this compact each State acceded as a State, and is an integral party, its co States forming, as to itself, the other party; that the Government created by this compact was not made the exclusive or final judge of the extent of the powers delegated to itself, since that would have made its discretion, and not the Constitution, the measure of its powers; but that, as in all other cases of compact among powers having no common judge, each party has an equal right to judge for itself, as well of infractions as of the mode and measure of redress.

The friends of that "Democratic Party out of Kentucky take an immense interest in the success of the Duvall "Democratic" Party here. They send our reaction Radicals cheer, and bid them God-speed. Messrs. Vallandigham, Long, Corry, etc., of Ohio, think that the salvation of the Party depends upon the success of Duvall and Secession in Kentucky at the August election. Mr. V. has actually written a letter cordially indorsing the First of May Convention! Fellow-citizens of Kentucky, that is the Party whose leaders ask you to put them in power in this old Union State, made glorious by its devotion to the Republic through all of its trying ordeals. Will you do it? Shall Kentucky at last indorse

SECESSION STRAIGHT OUT?

Shade of Henry Clay! must we ask you such a question? Then up, fellow-citizens, and prevent this dark disgrace.

VOTE DOWN SECESSION

by an overwhelming majority. Vote it down in every county, ward, and precinct of the State. Farmers, quit your plows, and merchants your counting-rooms, and save your State and your country from the evils that would come upon her if

SECESSION

should gain a foothold, a nucleus, a rallying *point d'appui*, in this old loyal Commonwealth.

It must not be, and it shall not be.

HOW THE RADICAL SECESSIONISTS SUPPORT PRESIDENT JOHNSON.

We present the following editorial from an Ohio Secession paper—which professes to be a Democratic paper—the Secessionists all claim to be the real Democracy—in order that the voters of Kentucky may see for themselves how the Secession Radicals of Ohio of the Duvall stripe support President

Johnson. The Ohio organ is honest and outspoken. It says what it thinks. Its coadjutors in Kentucky think it necessary to conceal *their* animus to a great extent.

Read, Kentuckians who support the President in good faith, read the following from a Cincinnati Secession paper :

OUR PLATFORM AND TICKET.

The State Sovereignty party of Ohio again bears its testimony in favor of its cardinal principle so perfectly expressed in the first Kentucky resolution, and against consolidation. It sees both Congress and the President struggling against each other for the right of the Federal Government to interpret its own powers, and it can take no part with either. It puts its ticket for State officers in the field and appeals to the voters to consider the crisis and give it their support. The time has come for Democrats to stand by principle and by the friends of principle, and to rebuke the violence of Republicans and the treachery of pretended friends.

There is at the moment when we write an organized movement spreading among the Democrats, from Washington City and over the country, TO MERGE DEMOCRACY INTO IMPERIALISM IN THE INTEREST OF ANDY JOHNSON. HE BOASTS THAT HE IS THE SUCCESSOR AND CONTINUATOR OF LINCOLN; HE UTTERS EVERY DAY LINCOLN PHRASES AND LINCOLN IDEAS: HE IS SURROUNDED BY LINCOLN'S CABINET, AND THE ONLY DIFFERENCE BETWEEN HIM AND THE WILSONS AND SUMNERS AND STEVENS AND MORRILLS IS THAT HE HAS STOPPED IN LINCOLN'S TRACKS, WHILE THEY HAVE BEEN CONTINUALLY ADVANCING. THEY ARE ALL HEADING IN THE SAME WRONG DIRECTION; THEY ARE ALL GOING THE ROAD TO PERDITION.

The time has come to redeem our honored old party from such hands. We have resorted to the proper means of organizing a campaign, which has for its object to warn and enlist the voters. To vote for the Johnson-Morgan ticket is the same thing as selling out to the abolitionists; to accept their doctrine is to go over to the enemy. We had better disband and have no ticket and no candidates than hypocritically to pretend to be Democrats, and yet join one of the two wings of republicanism.

We are not forgetful of our obligations to our friends who are deceived. In Ohio no other State ticket but the Republican has any chance for success, so that we do not injure anybody. In the States south of the Ohio river, in Kentucky, for instance, the Democracy is sure to succeed, AND THEREFORE ON NEITHER SIDE OF THE RIVER CAN IT DO HARM TO DECLARE OUR PRINCIPLES AND VOTE FOR OUR MEN. The necessity of declaring principles at the same time was never greater. It is all important, for without it we can only lose the mission of our party.

We have had a horrible sectional war; the half of the States are one pile of ruin; the residue are on the downward road, and despotism has mastered the energies of opposition. Principles utterly destructive of all self-government are gaining ground because of the weakness of our opposition. We have taken the field as Jefferson did in 1798, under the flag he flung into the face of the Alien and Sedition Laws. We make the square issue. We stand directly over against both Congress and the President, upon our distinct platform of State Sovereignty, Western interests, the Interior Policy, free trade, hard money, and the bold assertion of true Democracy.

We have followed the illustrious example of Thomas Jefferson, and without fear, favor or affection we appeal to the people.

Jefferson's mere advice would have been nothing if he had not followed it up by action. In vain had all his learning, services and intellectual powers been exerted to cope with the crisis, if he had not responded to the uttermost

to that necessity of every civil convulsion, which is undoubtedly to make the square, frank and perfect issue on abstract doctrine with our opponents. He drew up a set of abstractions in his study, at the request of his friends, the Nicholases, and those sheets of *prepared paper*, a power vastly greater than gunpowder or gun cotton, when they were promulged by the Legislatures of Kentucky and Virginia, destroyed at once the Egyptian pyramid of consolidation. But what if Jefferson had evaded, compromised, hid his meaning, denied his belief, and used two voices, as is the universal partisan habit of the day? The defeat of Jefferson for the Presidency by Adams would have been the consequence, and the destruction of the Federal Constitution, that model of majesty, beauty and proportion, an edifice more precious and glorious than all the other governmental structures of mankind put together. That same edifice is now in our hands, and in greater danger than it was in Jefferson's time. The *Erostrati*, who delight in the fame of waste, arson and murder, are even now applying the torch. And for that we ring the tocsin, the fire-bell, to awaken our sleeping citizens, promulge our platform, and we put our ticket in the field.—*Cincinnati West and South*.

RINGING QUOTATIONS FROM THE LOUISVILLE BOWLING-GREEN
COURIER OF 1861-'62—READ WHAT THE LOUISVILLE BOWLING
GREEN-COURIER SAID OF THE UNION SOLDIERS OF KENTUCKY
—WHAT IT SAID OF THE PEOPLE OF KENTUCKY WHO SUS-
TAINED THE UNION—WHAT IT SAID OF THE NOBLEST, THE
PUREST, THE GREATEST AND THE BEST MEN IN KENTUCKY.

It is known very generally that the old Louisville Courier is the soul of the Secession-Radical Party of this State, now engaged in reorganizing and reviving Secession-Radicalism in the hope of ostracizing Union men and of inducing Kentucky to wheel at last into the ranks of Secession, and embrace the loathsome monster whose trail of fire and blood, of poverty and desolation, has swept over nearly half the States of the Union.

It is also known that the Louisville Courier did all it could do to coerce Kentucky out of the Union and into a position of antagonism to the Government of the United States. It is well understood that while it was published in Louisville, it did all that lay in its power to give aid and comfort to the open enemies of the United States. After its treasonable utterances became so outrageous as to be no longer tolerable, it removed to Bowling Green, and there, under the so-called "Provisional Government" of Kentucky, continued to belch forth its emissions against the Union and its defenders, whether the latter were native Kentuckians or Union men from other States.

In order that the loyal men of Kentucky may see under what auspices the Secession-Radicals are striving to gain power in this State, we give below copious extracts from the files of the said Louisville-Bowling-Green Courier, as reprinted in the Louisville Democrat of a late date. Kentuckians, read for yourselves,—read and say whether you are ready to follow a party which has such a leader for its guide as the Louisville Courier. These extracts are damaging. They are terrible. They are annihilating:

THE BOWLING-GREEN-LOUISVILLE-COURIER.

EXTRACTS FROM THE FILES.

Its Scorn of the Northern Conservatives—It will never Accept a Pardon—It prefers Burning the Southern Towns to Seeing them in the Hands of the "Yankees"—It desires the Duly Elected Legislature to be Driven Out—It Sustains the Mob Government of Bowling Green and its Acts—Some of its Acts—The Seizure of the Nashville Road—Seizure of the Funds and Assets without Primary Evidence Urged—Sheriffs to be Fined and Imprisoned—The Searching of Houses for Arms—Fines and Imprisonment of Union Men—Insults to the Union Army and Soldiers—"The Flop-Eared Dutch"—Insults to Gallant Union Officers—Cruelty to Prisoners Recommended.

THE BOWLING-GREEN-LOUISVILLE-COURIER ON THE SITUATION.

Among the bitterest sheets published in the rebellious States was the Courier. It was then, as now, frantically, unreasonably confident, and dealt extensively in humbug. As a specimen we take the following:

IT WILL NEVER DO TO TAKE ANY OATHS, OR ASK PARDON.

[From the Bowling Green Courier, January 31, 1862.]

Let these blind leaders of the blind (i. e., Northern Democrats) first conquer the South, then dispose of her inhabitants as they please; for when Lincoln's rule shall have been established over the Confederate States, there *will not be one man left within them all to beg for mercy or hope for pardon.*

The Louisville Democrat had an article opposing the burning of the Southern towns, alleging as a reason a desire for them to remain as suitable marts for produce and goods from this part of the country. The Courier was especially spiteful over the article, and quoted it, introducing the quotation as

IT RECOMMENDS BURNING THE SOUTHERN TOWNS.

[From the Bowling Green Courier, January 31, 1862.]

The Louisville Democrat, which is not cunning enough to conceal its thoughts and motives, has the following in relation to the charge of sending incendiaries South to burn our towns. We can say to such as the Democrat that the Southern people would infinitely prefer *to burn their towns rather than they should be infested by the Yankees or be tributary to them.*

Whether the editor of the Courier was in Columbia at the conflagration we can't say, but it is evident he wished to see the Kentucky towns burned after the Confederates were driven out, if language means anything.

February 4, 1862, it publishes the names of Union men at Eddyville who voted for Trimble, to hold them up to odium and persecution by the mob that robbed and plundered under the pretense of Southern rights.

February 7, 1862, it says:

Kentuckians, if you have the spirit of men you will rise up to a man and drive out the traitors at Frankfort who have betrayed the State.

That little scoundrel Garret Davis, bogus Senator from Kentucky, loses no time after taking his seat to begin his dirty work.—*Bowling Green Courier*, January 13, 1862.

The administration sought to conquer Kentucky with gold. It bought up every political bankrupt and desperado in the State, from Crittenden and Guthrie down to Garret Davis, Jabe Johnson and Dick Jacobs, &c.—*Bowling Green Courier*, January 13, 1862.

IN TROUBLE.—Quartermaster, alias Colonel, alias Judge Rufus King Williams, formerly of Mayfield, Ky., is, we learn, in trouble. . . . We know Colonel Williams pretty well. We are sorry to be compelled to admit that we know him pretty well. A more unprincipled man never lived—not one who *would sell* himself for a less price, or betray his purchaser more readily. When we learned that the Administration were in the Kentucky market, buying up the recreant sons of that still noble old State, we at once set it down that Judge Williams would close with them, on their own terms. When we have been asked if, at least, a portion of them who had accepted Lincoln bribes would not, for a consideration, betray the Federals to whom they had sold themselves, we have invariably replied that Judge Williams would certainly do so. That General Smith has cause to doubt the faith of his tory subordinate, we are satisfied from our knowledge of the man. Notwithstanding the complaints and denials of Judge Williams' partieuclar friend and *accomplice in crime*, Judge Trimble, through the Louisville Democrat, Colonel Williams is, with his other accomplishments, an arrant coward, &c., &c.—*Bowling Green Courier*, January 16, 1862.

Judge Trimble having been defeated for Congress, the Courier says:

So Judge Trimble, the vile traitor to his section, is again disappointed. *Bowling Green Courier*, February 4, 1862.

The windy braggarts, *Leslie Combs* and W. S. Rosecerans, have been speechifying in Washington. Leslie gravely informed his hearers that "Kentucky's army would move forward, and no winter quarters were wanted for them." *Leslie was always great at gasing*.—*Bowling Green Courier*, January 4, 1862.

Now, it will naturally be asked, Has the Courier changed its opinions since it gave utterance to the above sentiments? Has it changed its opinions of the gentlemen so courteously and *democratically* referred to by it, especially of Messrs. Guthrie, Crittenden, Magoffin, Williams, "Dick Jacobs", "Jabe Johnson"; "the windy braggarts, *Leslie Combs* and W. S. Rosecerans"; "Judge Trimble, the vile traitor to his section"; and "that little scoundrel, Garret Davis"? Doesn't it think of those men now pretty much as it did then? Does it apologize for anything it said of them, of the United States Government, of the Union, of the loyal Legislature of Kentucky, of the Union people of Kentucky?

Doesn't the Courier now indorse these extracts from its *Bowling Green* columns? On Monday last, it said this of the quotations:

The Democrat occasionally relieves the dull monotony of its columns by extracts from *other and better papers*. On Saturday last it treated its readers to a column or two of clippings from old numbers of the "Louisville-Bowling-Green-Nashville Courier"; but, although a little out of date, we ven-

ture to say that the verdict of its readers is that the Democrat has not for a month of Sundays published such a variety of lively, sprightly, and pungent paragraphs.

If our neighbor wishes to further gratify its readers, and do something to increase his circulation, we shall be most happy to furnish him with other numbers of this *excellent* and popular paper, from which he can cull *good* things *ad libitum*.

Isn't that pretty close on to a reindorsement of the "excellent and popular" Bowling Green *democratic* Courier? There doesn't seem to be any *repudiation* of the sentiments uttered by it in '61, '62, etc., in the paragraph from its Monday's issue. We should say that there is a real glorifying of those sentiments in that reference to them. Doesn't the Courier exult in them *now*?

Last week or week before it called its *present* party here in Kentucky the "rebel democracy!" Isn't that rather plain in a loyal community for a *loyal* paper? Does it acknowledge allegiance still to the Confederacy? Really, upon what times have we fallen here when a paper openly and unblushingly calls its party, a party that is striving to secure the entire control of Kentucky, "the rebel Democracy"! What are we to think or say of a paper professing to be a "democratic" journal which *seems* to glory in the atrocious utterances it put forth when it was doing its utmost to dismember the Union? Do our patriotic citizens reflect upon the almost infinite harm to the reconciliation of the country and the success of President Johnson's policy this unblushing reaction party, this old secession party, very thinly veiled under professions of "democracy," is doing? It is an incubus upon the President's labors, a mill-stone around his neck, since it professes, in a sort of round-about, lackadaisical way, to uphold a part of his course just enough to enable his opponents to quote the sayings and doings of the Kentucky reactionists against him and his policy!

A Union Democratic United States Senator said, not long ago, that, unless the First of May Convention people in this State should desist from their mad course, the President's supporters would lose in Pennsylvania alone *seventy thousand* votes in the approaching election in that State! If the loyal, conservative men of Kentucky want the President defeated in his noble efforts to calm the distractions and heal the disorders of this country, let them give countenance to the efforts of these old disappointed secessionists in this State to revive the "rebel democracy" of Kentucky; but if they wish to sustain the friends of the President in the North, they will rally as one man against this most unwise step which a few ambitious old secession leaders have taken, and which they seem bent upon pushing forward, no matter how disastrous may be the consequences either to the State or the country at large.

We have repeatedly asked the Louisville Courier whether it now adheres to what it said in 1861-'92 and subsequently? We have asked whether it retracts now anything it said then? Whether it apologizes or expresses any regrets for what it said either against the Union and the Government or any

of the distinguished Kentuckians which it so vilely abused? And we have received no word in response. It is silent!

It does not, it has not retracted a line or a word it said. It expresses no regrets for its curses against the Union or the loyal men of the Government, good noble men of Kentucky and of other States who battled so bravely and so nobly to save the land we love so well! Peruse the above extracts again, and remember that the Louisville Courier STILL GLORIES IN THEM, for it does not repudiate any sentiments, or sentence, it put forth when it was trying to PULL DOWN THE REPUBLIC and with it bury the hopes of freedom all over the world!

Shall such atrocities go unrebuked at the polls by the loyal people of Kentucky? Citizens of Kentucky, the answer is with you! Vote for Duvall and his Secession party, and you will indorse every thing that party says or has ever said! We leave the issue with you. You must answer to your own consciences, to patriotism, to your country, to freedom in all lands and throughout all ages for the action you take upon this great question of the Union vs. Secession in the present canvass. The issue is squarely made up and sharply presented. Those who sustain Duvall sustain disunion; those who sustain Hobson support the Union and repel the foul slanders which Secessionists have hurled at the Republic.

A FEW MORE REMRKS TO THE MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE WHO ATTENDED THE
FIRST OF MAY CONVENTION.

[From the Bowling Green Courier, January 9th, 1862.]

There may be some who have sold themselves to the agents of the Northern usurpation, and some so craven that they dare not be free, who prefer the mob administration to the government at Bowling Green, and would yet pay tribute to those who, in trampling in the mire the constitution of the State, destroyed the government of the administration of which they formed a part.

* * * * *

These remarks have been suggested by a proclamation of Beriah Magoffin, claiming to be Governor of Kentucky, &c.

This Bowling Green government had been made up by a gathering of self-appointed delegates claiming to represent seventy counties—nearly as many as the Duvall Convention, and pretty much the same men. Since the Courier approves so warmly of it, it is well to see what it has been doing. We have it in the reports of the acts of the "Provisional Government."

The first is "an act regulating the currency, requiring all sheriffs, clerks and all other officers to take Kentucky and Tennessee notes and Confederate treasury notes in payment of State dues." Approved December 10, 1861.

"An act to amend the charter of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company."

By this the road was seized or stolen without explanation.

SEIZURE OF BANK ASSETS, ETC.—RESOLUTION.

Resolved, by the Council of the Provisional Government of the State of Kentucky, That our members of Congress be requested and directed to obtain

the passage of a law by the Congress of the Confederate States authorizing SECONDARY evidence to be used as competent proof in a certain class of cases, in the courts of the Confederate States, in proceedings in such courts, under the sequestration laws, against the *funds and assets of banking corporations in Kentucky*, located within the lines of the Federal Government, when primary evidence cannot be obtained.

The effect of that act was to allow the confiscation or plundering of banks upon a suspicion that they were not sympathizers with the rebellion. Primary evidence was not required; secondary—that is, an informer's belief—would satisfy.

An act, approved December 4th, proposes means to seize the assets belonging to the Bank of Kentucky, the Northern Bank of Kentucky, and the Farmers' Bank of Kentucky. The acts are reported in the Courier of January 4th.

An act, approved December 16th, authorizes the arrest and punishment of the Sheriff of Todd for paying money to the State Government.

[From the Bowling Green Courier, January 18, 1862.]

We call the particular attention of the citizens of Warren county to an advertisement in the Courier of Mr. Guilford O. Talbott, Inspector of Arms for the county:

ADVERTISEMENT.

ATTENTION, CITIZENS OF WARREN COUNTY!

Having been appointed Inspector of Arms in Warren county by the Governor and Provisional Government of Kentucky, it is my duty to notify you that those of you who have arms which you will not use in the cause of your country are required, within twenty days, to deliver the same to me, at my office in Bowling Green, where they will be properly valued and receipted for. Those of you subject to military duty, and having no guns, are required to pay, as a substitute, twenty dollars, which will also be receipted for and liquidated at maturity by the Government.

Office up stairs in Roberts' buildings, in Nashville street.

GUILFORD O. TALBOTT.

January 10, 1862.

Sec. 6. All persons required by this act to deliver a gun to the Inspector, and shall fail to do so, or who shall secrete his arms, shall be arrested by the Inspector, Sheriff, or Magistrate of the county for trial, and if it shall appear that such person is guilty of the charge, he shall be fined fifty dollars and imprisoned in the county jail until said fine is paid, and shall be disarmed as an enemy, and his arms delivered to the Inspector.

Jan 17 d10

DOWN ON THE SHERIFFS.

An act approved January 29, 1862, makes the refusal of any officer of the State to acknowledge the Provisional Government an offense bailable at \$5,000 in good securities, and punishable by \$1,000, and imprisonment in the county jail not less than one or more than two years.—*Bowling Green Courier*, February 8, 1862.

This government seems, from the above, instituted for robbery. It first seizes the Nashville railroad; seizes the bank stock and assets on bare suspicion; arrests and imprisons Sheriffs, and fines them for keeping their oaths to the regular government; authorizes a man, without warrant, to search for arms and take them: to inflict fines and imprisonments. It was a regular confiscating, plundering concern. And this is what has the Courier's hearty approval.

THE BOWLING GREEN COURIER ON THE UNION ARMY.

It is rumored that General Tom Crittenden has a mixed regiment in his division, one half negroes and the other half Indianians.—*Bowling Green Courier*, December 24.

Rumors are rife about Hopkinsville that the renegade Tom Crittenden will make an early advance upon that place. We doubt it.—*Courier*, December 24, 1862.

We find the following in the Louisville Journal of the 18th. The Captain Dur it speaks of is a little Dutch Jew, who cannot pronounce his own name correctly, and is as cowardly and noisy a whelp as can be found. *It is of such material that the Yankee companies of Kentucky are made.*

Colonel Jim Jackson, who had been bought by Lincoln at a high figure and paid for in hard cash, had gone on to Washington to see about matters, swearing that he could not stomach everything, and that, unless Cameron's policy was disavowed by the Administration, he would throw up his commission.—*Bowling Green Courier*, December 27, 1862.

We pray to heaven that when our Kentucky boys meet these Hessian hirelings in conflict that they will not leave one of the wretches to tell their friends the extermination of the rabble crew who have come here to subjugate our people and set free our slaves.—*Bowling Green Courier*, Dec. 27, '62.

It seems Major Billy Megowan, of Louisville, commanded Jim Jackson's cavalry in the fight with Col. Forrest's Rangers at Sacramento, on Saturday last. Billy is a great blusterer, and as arrant a coward as can be found in Christendom. We wager that he found it convenient to make himself scarce at an early period of the engagement.—*Bowling Green Courier*, Dec. 31, '62.

It was rumored in Knoxville, a few days ago, that six hundred Dutch cavalry were in Crittenden county, on their way to Princeton. Two companies of Col. Forrest's famous cavalry, under Captains Overton and May, were promptly dispatched in pursuit of them. They were, however, unable to overhual the *flop-eared thieves*.—*Bowling Green Courier*, Jan. 7, '62.

Now that the Yankees are placed in their true position before the world as "tyrants without courage and cowards without shame," the battle for the South is virtually won.—*Bowling Green Courier*, Jan. 7, '62.

We might quote more of these slanderous, vulgar articles, but this is enough to show the whole spirit of that paper. We will conclude with one atrocity wherein the editor abuses and insults helpless prisoners for a very natural complaint of distressed men:

[From the Bowling Green Courier, Jan. 13, 1862.]

The Yankee prisoners in New Orleans have had the insufferable impudence to address a sort of protest to Gen. Palfry against the reasonably strict conditions of their confinement, in which occurs the following paragraph:

"Since our confinement, not even the ladies of New Orleans have been permitted to *visit* us, to *sympathize* with us, and to weep over our misfortunes."

"Is it possible," says the Mobile Republican, "that these ragamuffin, cowardly blackguards who were captured flying from the soil of the South, which they had invaded with the most ruthless intents of slaughter and rapine, to the slogan of Booty and Beauty—is it possible that they are so ignorant of Southern women as to believe, if not pretend, 'the ladies of New Orleans would visit and sympathize' with their loathsome enemies, and 'weep over their misfortunes', which are only to be deplored in that they fall far short of what is deserved by the scurvy victims of war's retribution?"

Of the necessity for the restrictions we will not speak, but is there any excuse for a newspaper to quote with tacit approval such gross and vindictive insults to utterly defenseless and helpless prisoners? With cowardly cruelty, the Mobile Republican and Bowling Green Courier invoked still greater severities upon the prisoners.

The Courier, after publishing the orders of his bogus government to seize the funds and assets of the Kentucky banks, says:

Virgil McKnight, President of the Bank of Kentucky, has made a miserable investment of a half million for his bank in Lincoln stock. We must now advise him to invest all his money in Confederate bonds as the only way to save himself and his bank from ruin.—*Bowling Green Courier*, Dec. 21, 1861.

A letter from Governor Magoffin to the Journal it pronounces "a pitiful letter from Mr. Magoffin."—*Bowling Green Courier*, December 24, 1862.

It seems the late Governor Magoffin is still in the hands of his tormentors of the Journal.

* * * * *
The man of the Journal understands his duty as dog-pelter and whiper-in for Lincoln. It is the custom of such first to use the lash severely to bring the hounds to the master's feet, and then to crack it over him to make him lick the feet to keep him crouching there.—*Bowling Green Courier*, December 26, 1861.

The Dick Jacob so applauded by the Abolitionists of the Commercial is a chap who, until he was bought by Lincoln, was so entirely Southern that he could find no fire-eater sufficiently intense for him.

* * * * *
Now he is always ready to do Lincoln's dirty work, and in the bogus Legislature he is the most abject and contemptible of all the Lincolnites.—*Bowling Green Courier*, December 27, 1861.

Dissimulation, fraud, falsehood, and bribery; these are the instruments upon which the administration has relied for the subjugation of Kentucky and the other border slave States, and these are the only instruments used by the Prentices, Guthries, Davises, Griders, etc., in effecting a lodgment for Abolitionism and negro equality on Kentucky soil. *These men have counted the gold with which they were bought in open day and before the world, without a blush of shame, etc., etc.*—*Bowling Green Courier*, December 30, 1861.

Colonel Magoffin is the brother of Hon. Beriah Magoffin, late Governor of Kentucky. The Colonel seems to have inherited all the manly qualities of the family, and left Beriah scarcely an heirloom.—*Bowling Green Courier*, January 4, 1862.

A NOBLE LETTER FROM GOVERNOR BRAMLETTE.

Gov. Thomas E. Bramlette sent the following noble and patriotic letter to the great Union Hobson ratification meeting at Louisville on the evening of June 3d:

FRANKFORT, Ky., July 2, 1866.

GENTLEMEN: Your letter inviting me to attend a Hobson ratification meeting at Louisville on to-morrow (Tuesday) night, received. Official engagements will preclude my presence on the occasion.

It affords me much gratification to see the enthusiasm inspired by the name

of that gallant soldier and true patriot, Edward H. Hobson, being placed before the people as the Union candidate for Clerk of the Court of Appeals.

I have known Gen. Hobson intimately many years. In all the relations of life he commands the esteem and confidence of all who know him. As a citizen, upright and just; as a soldier, gallant, brave, generous, and without reproach; his countrymen may well be proud of such a man, and by his election will prove that republics are not ungrateful.

No man could have been more aptly chosen to meet the issue presented by the First of May Convention. He well represents the true Unionism which pulsates the heart of Kentuckians; that Unionism which seeks to preserve the unity of our Government, and the restoration of all its just constitutional powers over our entire limits, with the re-establishment of the proper relations of the States to the Government, and which opposes with unbending will the efforts from every quarter to break up, overbear, or destroy, either by force or innovation.

The First of May Convention, composed of men whose *sympathies* or *actions* were in support of rebellion, defiant of the results of the war, and regardless of the effects of renewing the conflict, has, by a distinct party organization and nomination of a candidate of like sympathies, forced upon the people of Kentucky the issue whether the control and government of the State shall remain with those who upheld the cause of the Union, or shall be turned over to those who sought its destruction.

No matter what pretensions may be set up—no matter what platitudes have been put forth by the convention or may be by its adherents—the issue made by an organization under any party name for party purposes, of men who have stood in hostile array to the Government of the Union during our fearful civil war, cannot be mistaken—cannot be ignored. The issue so made is, shall those who succeeded in putting down rebellion and maintaining the Union hold the political control and Government of the State; or shall those who failed in their hopes and efforts to destroy the Union be given the administration of the State Government? This issue was not provoked by the Union men—it has been forced upon them against their will.

It should not have been done. Had no such issue been thrust upon us during the present year, our people would have so blended in harmony before another year as to make such an issue impracticable.

No one more deeply deplores the issue than I. Since the close of the war, all my personal and official influence has been given to bring about that harmony and kindly feeling which constitutes the only solid foundation of peace. It has been with sensations of profoundest pleasure that I have witnessed the return and rapid growth of this feeling among our people—the evanishment of bitterness and hostility, and the establishment of that *solid peace* which rests upon a “union of hearts” as well as “a union of hands.” A hearty, healthy sentiment of openness was being established; and my heart glowed forth with pride for my State, and swelled with gratitude to God for the favorable results so happily attained. The soldiers who had confronted each other in hostile array on many a bloody field greeted each other in cordial reunion, forgetting that they were ever otherwise than friends and brothers.

The First of May Convention, whether intentionally or not it is now needless to inquire, has broken in upon this healthful and cheering state of affairs, and has thrust upon us a struggle which threatens to disrupt those kindly relations just forming, and to revive and intensify the bitter memories of the struggle through which we had just passed—as we hoped forever.

Every citizen, whatever may have been his position during the war, who now in good faith desires peace and the perpetuation of our Government, and who wishes the sad memories of the past years of strife and war forgotten and buried, should unite to defeat the movement of the First-of-May Conven-

tion, which is adverse to such consummation. The First-of-May Convention has wrought much evil already, and is fraught with much more. It has begotten strife where amity prevailed; it has evoked sad memories and bitter feelings where oblivion was covering the past; it has created division where unity existed; it has broken the moral force which an undivided support of the President would have given to the proper adjustment of the pending question of restoration of the Government; it has stayed the hand of Executive clemency in behalf of those Kentuckians who are amenable to penalties, and may upraise the arm of justice to a rigid enforcement of the laws; it has given to those who oppose the restoration of the Southern States to their position in the Government a weapon almost as formidable as rebellion itself; it has placed the returned Confederate soldier in a painfully-false position. If he sustains the action of the convention, his good faith will be questioned by all good Union men; if he opposes it, he will be denounced by "sympathizers" as a *renegade*, because they claim to be the natural allies of the Confederate soldier. If he shall not take sides, he will be charged with want of courage to show his hand. Thus he is to be victimized, after years of danger and battle, by those who professed to sympathize with him during the war, but who assail his peace and good faith through the First-of-May Convention. It has forced the test whether the generous, forgiving spirit of the victors—who so cordially welcomed home and rehabilitated those who, by rebellion, had forfeited all—shall be met with generous support, or be repelled with unsated hostility.

The issue so made is too clear and distinct to be covered up under a party name or obscured by abusive and reproachful epithets.

The candidates are worthy representatives of the issue; both gentlemen of good personal character and standing, but separated distinctly by the impassable gulf which divides the friends and supporters of the Union from the friends and supporters of a defunct rebellion.

The true friends of the Union will not desert to the ranks of rebellion after the battle has been fought and won.

Those who now rush to the rescue, and seek to renew the strife of 1861 in Kentucky, were, while they professed to be Union men, mistaken. The clank of arms and smoke of battle confused their choice; the abatement of the strife and return of peace restores them to their normal sentiments and reunites them to their true status.

Union men have differed—sometimes bitterly—upon questions of policy in conducting the war, and upon policies or modes of restoration, but these differences, being temporary in character, necessarily pass away upon the adjustment of the question. But the difference between *Union* and *Secession* is the difference between *life* and *death*—it is *irreconcilable* and *perpetual*.

Union men may differ among themselves as to the best mode of maintaining or conducting the Government, but they will always differ far more widely with those who desire its destruction.

Between the friend and supporter of the Government of the Union and him whose *sympathies* were with those who fought to destroy the Union, there can be but one choice for Union men.

If it be *meritorious* to have fought on the gory field of Shiloh, and many other hard-fought fields of blood, to maintain an unbroken Union, and to be for the entire restoration of the Government, then General Edward H. Hobson meets the full measure of merit.

If it be *meritorious* to have stood in "sympathy" with those in arms to overthrow the Government and divide the Union, then Judge Duvall, as the representative of the First-of-May Convention, fills the measure of merit.

I speak for myself that, while I can forgive and forget the wrongs of rebellion, I never can declare by my vote that it was *meritorious*. I am willing to *ignore*, but not *reward* it. I might be willing to support a man who fought in

good faith against us, but came back in good faith and manifested himself to be true and loyal to the Union, and who stood for office upon *his own merits*, but not for any man who may run upon the *wrong* of his *merit*.

If Judge Duvall were an independent candidate, resting his claims upon his own personal merits, he would occupy a very different attitude in my estimation; but being the representative of the First-of-May Convention, and therefore of the organized disloyalty of the State, which seeks to keep alive the embers of a rebellious sentiment, he must be judged accordingly.

The name "DEMOCRAT," assumed by that convention, has neither length nor breadth enough to cover up or hide from the public gaze the patent fact that those who composed that body *were not Union men, were not Democrats*, but were men whose *sympathies and acts were adverse to the Union*. The candidate of a party that has no word of thanks for the Union soldier—no word of condemnation for secession and rebellion throughout nineteen resolutions—can have no personal merits sufficient to abate one jot or tittle of my opposition.

I am for my country first, and its defenders next.

Yours, truly,

THOS. E. BRAMLETTE.

SPIRIT OF THE REACTION PARTY OF KENTUCKY.

A correspondent sends us the following specimen of the *decency* of the Reaction party in this State, clipped from some dirty little secession sheet in the interior:

We warn all honest men, who really have a sentiment of conservatism, to beware of this half-breed party. It will as certainly betray them into the hands of the Radicals as the night follows the day. The leaders, as a general rule, are a set of dirty dogs, who never had any fair claim to honesty, integrity, or political virtue—fellows who would trade off the graves of their fathers for office—who would descend to social equality with a negro for his vote, if he had one—who would sell the Constitution of their country, or their country itself, to gain office—who would betray their dearest friend into a prison for the chance to rob his house of its furniture—who rob and plunder father, mother, sister, and brother—*for money!*

They are infinitely worse than the Radicals, because they are more sneaking. Their minds, hearts, and souls are black with deceit, lies, and all manner of uncleanness. Beware of them. They are children of the devil—and their whole purpose is to deceive, defraud, and betray—*for office and money!*

This is the way in which the best, the noblest men of Kentucky are spoken of by a paper in full communion with the First of May Conventionists! Our correspondent informs us that the writer of the paragraph quoted has only recently had the pains and penalties, the disabilities of treason removed from him, through the magnanimity of the President, whose supporters he thus characterizes; he was one of Forrest's raiders. He shows his gratitude and sense of decency by heaping his vile billingsgate upon the noble Union men of Kentucky, those who stood by the President, the Union, and their State and their country in the hour of thickest gloom, when the hands of hordes of guerrillas and plunderers were raised for their destruction. What a beautiful Union "Democratic" party they constitute!

DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE SECESSION DEMOCRACY OF KENTUCKY AND THE UNION DEMOCRACY OF THE NORTH.

If the Duvall party in this State isn't a Secession party or faction or clique, why didn't its convention, so-called, repudiate Secession? We have asked that plain question several times, and the oracles are dumb. Those reactionists who speak of the amendment abolishing slavery as the "constitutional amendment *said* to be adopted"—do *they* say so?—claim to be the Democratic Party! It's a rich joke. Democratic conventions—provided they are not something else under the *name* of Democracy—repudiate Secession. A resolution of that nature is usually the first one adopted. A case in point occurred on the opposite side of the Ohio the other day, as we see from the last issue of the National Democrat, published in Jeffersonville.

At the Democratic convention of Clarke county, Ind., held on the previous Saturday, and which was most numerously attended, the first resolution adopted, unanimously, reads as follows:

Resolved, That we are now, as heretofore, ardently attached to the Union of the States under the Constitution of the United States; **THAT WE DENY THE RIGHT OF ANY STATE TO SECEDE, AND HOLD THAT ALL ATTEMPTS AT SECESSION ARE NULL AND VOID**; that all the States are now States of this Union, as before the rebellion, and we deny the power of the General Government, under the Constitution, to exclude a State from the Union or to govern it as a Territory.

That sounds patriotic, or, if you please, Democratic. Old Hickory would have recognized it as the ring of the true metal. Why didn't the Duvall First-of-May concern, if it was Democratic, pass such a resolution as that? It would have meant something. No one could have misunderstood it. That body, however, steered very clear of all such heresies as denying "the right of any State to secede" or of declaring that "all attempts at Secession are null and void;" and yet its leaders are trying to make the simple believe that it was a democratic body, and they hope to catch some gudgeons by the joke. They place a high estimate on the intelligence of the people, don't they?

DAGUERREOTYPE OF THE LOUISVILLE COURIER—THE LEADER AND ORGAN OF THE SECESSION RADICALS OF KENTUCKY.

The Louisville Courier, after having been first a neutral paper, and then a Whig paper, and then a Native American paper, and then a Sons of Liberty paper, and then a Whig paper, and then a Know-Nothing paper, and then a Democratic paper, and then an Abolition paper, and then a Whig paper, and then a Buchanan paper, and then a secession paper—is recognized as the leader of the "secession Democracy" of Kentucky. What an organ and leader they have got!

THE SECESSION DEMOCRACY OF OHIO IN WARM SYMPATHY WITH THE SECESSION DUVALL DEMOCRACY OF KENTUCKY.

There is a Secession faction in Ohio answering exactly to the Secession faction of Kentucky. There is a Secession faction in nearly every State of the North. It is small, we admit; but its bitterness, its radicalism, and its treason are in an inverse ratio to its numbers—the smaller the numbers, the more malignant and infamous the spirit. In Ohio, this Secession faction is represented by such men as Alexander Long, late a member of Congress, W. M. Corry, C. L. Vallandigham, and others of less notoriety.

Like the Secession Radicals of Kentucky, these Ohio Secession Radicals refuse to unite with the great mass of the Union Democracy and other Union citizens in patriotically sustaining the President and the Union. They are Disunionists. They denounce the Union, and the President because he sustains it.

They have recently held a convention in Cincinnati and nominated candidates for Supreme Judge, Secretary of State, and other offices, and appointed a State Central Committee.

In order that our readers may see what Secession Democracy in Ohio is, we shall give the platform of that Cincinnati Radical Secession Convention entire, just as we find it in one of the organs now lying before us. It is in the following words, *italics* and all:

THE RESOLUTIONS OF THE SECESSION DEMOCRACY OF OHIO.

Resolved, That the lowest form of government to which these States, lately free, independent, and sovereign, are descending is a military despotism; and that the highest form is the old Union, to which they are voluntary parties, according to the following resolution of the Kentucky Legislature of 1798:

"Resolved, That the several States composing the United States are not united on the principle of unlimited submission to their General Government, but that by a compact, under the style and title of a Constitution for the United States, and of amendments thereto, they constitute a General Government for special purposes—delegated to that Government certain definite powers, reserving, each State to itself, the residuary mass of right to their self-government; and that whenever the General Government assumes undelegated power, its acts are unauthorized, void, and of no force; that to this compact each State acceded as a State, and is an integral party, its co-States forming, as to itself, the other party; that the Government created by this compact was not made the exclusive or final judge of the extent of the powers delegated to itself, since that would have made its discretion, and not the Constitution, the measure of its powers; but that, as in all other cases of *compact among powers having no common judge, each party has an equal right to judge for itself, as well of infractions as of the mode and measure of redress.*"

Resolved, That having testified against the conquest of the Southern States in vain, we will make another effort to save the liberties of the citizens of the State of Ohio, now in danger of being as effectually destroyed as those of Virginia and South Carolina, according to the eternal law of God's universe, that whoever does injustice shall suffer injustice.

Resolved, That all the destructive subterfuges for oppressing the Southern States by compelling a forcible Union with them; by the devastation of their

property and lives by war upon them; by the injurious emancipation of negro slaves; by the attempt to obtrude our will as their law, in Civil Rights bills and Freedmen's Bureau bills, and constitutional provisions for altering the basis of representation from population to voters; and by the degradation of the army, all from hatred of the slaveholder, has recoiled on our own heads. The Yankee States have long since, by the same, devious policy differently expressed, bound the Western Sampson of the Mississippi Valley with green withes; but, having slain his Southern friends and neighbors, they are now shackling him with iron, which, in his thoughtless strength, he has been bringing for others.

Resolved, That the State of Ohio should require the President and Congress to co-operate in the restoration of the old relations of all the Southern States on terms of absolute equality; she refuses to recognize any other terms of Federal association than one of equals, and she is the greatest loser by an Imperial system of Atlantic empire which makes her a province of New York, corrupted with money, filled with soldiers and paying tribute to an Eastern despot. She is the center of the Union, and with her sister States South of the Ohio as well as North, has the majority of population and is the largest owner of the Federal property. She should now assert their common and individual right to be obeyed and respected by their servants at Washington.

Resolved, That the Republican party is an unconstitutional party, and has always been so, for it has sought to establish by the aid of mere majorities irrespective of the Constitution, the *permanent inequality of the States*, and that we make a square and direct issue with all its chiefs and all its principles.

At its very birth it claimed to monopolise the lands in the territories won by the common blood and treasure, and it wrested them to itself, by the aid of the Northwestern Democracy.

Next, It placed itself on the side of capital against labor in both Southern and Northern States, by its bank and tariffs for plundering industry.

Next, It went to war on pretense of avenging the wrongs of slavery, but really to drive off our Southern allies and to divide the free trade force so that Eastern capital should divide a hundred per cent on its manufactures.

Next, It intends permanently to seize the Government by keeping out the Southern States, when proposing conditions of admission too repugnant for acceptance.

Next, It will transform the system into a military despotism consolidated at the East, but guarding and garrisoning the West and South with soldiers.

The ascendancy of that party means the subjugation of the people of the Western as well as of the Southern States, and the destruction of Virginia and North Carolina, if we have the courage to assert the utmost of our principles, and to organize our State Sovereignty parties, and challenge continued free discussion. The census and the Constitution has now fairly given the interior States the power belonging to a majority of Federal votes, and if we are wise and patient, we can make our creed so many household words.

Resolved, That the late tariff war upon false pretenses of love for universal liberty of black people, but real hatred of their white masters, and all the legislation incident to it, show an original, fixed and corrupt purpose to make the West and South underlings in the Union against which they must raise up the old State Rights party on the doctrine of '93, and the measures of free trade, hard money, the fair distribution of public burthens and the supremacy of the white race.

We advocate with all our souls and strength the interests of the working-man, who should go with us heart and hand instead of organizing separately, because we alone can teach them how to keep their earnings; how to sell their labor and reduce their expenses; how to co-operate in getting cheap goods, cheap food, cheap houses, and how to make themselves independent and influential.

Resolved, That it takes interested men like Sprague and Simmons of Rhode Island, Wilson and Sumner of Massachusetts, Morrill of Maine, and Stevens of Pennsylvania, to be sealed to the odious tariff system which has broken our necks worse than an ox-yoke these forty years. None but the willfully blind can shut their eyes to the necessity of free trade in the products of human labor. The direct tax on the cotton and tobacco fields of the South, is a breach of the Constitution which protects our own corn and wheat fields, which will soon contain as many tax gatherers as mowers and reapers. The State of Ohio should put herself into the breach, for she has already suffered as much from the cunning use of temperance as the South has from that of abolition, and she is only now in time to save what is left. If the caucus would withdraw its members of Congress, the Western people would send free-trade delegations from every Western State.

Resolved, That the sheer force resorted to by Stanton for the draft, in defiance of all law, has a twin brother in Chase's system of greenbacks and so-called national banks. It was conceived and begotten in fraud upon the Eastern banking system, and started by devoting all its capital, a hundred and fifty millions, to the war fund, on promise of Government favors, and then was deliberately sacrificed by a Secretary of the Treasury, who kissed a dozen of them in a New York bank parlor in order to betray two thousand of them when necessary. But we are entirely opposed to the whole corporation paper money system, which is the favorite vice of the United States, and which is the nucleus of the railroad, manufacturing, and insurance companies, a feudal dynasty to which all the producers, whether farmers, planters, or mechanics, are tributary. The banking system is contrary to all notions of equality, the bankers being a privileged order; to all notions of economy and responsibility, the bankers being wasteful, luxurious, and not personally liable for their debts; to all notions of justice, the bankers monopolizing our credit for nothing, and lending it to borrowers at heavy interest instead of lending their own money, and finally compelling the governments of the States to take their paper promises on deposit for taxes. By periodical explosions of banks, and the collapse of paper money, the people of the United States pay probably as much annual tribute to bankers as would sustain their Government. There is no benefit whatever in the use of bank paper; it does not raise values nor diminish expenses; it does not increase capital nor employ labor; it is a cunning device to fatten the rich man's field by the sweat of the poor man's brow, and of course make it more difficult for the masses to live.

Resolved, That we protest against the monstrosity of merging Democracy in Johnsonism, which is being attempted by the union of the corrupt Republicans who adhere to the loaves and fishes, and the leaders of our party, for the sake of the loaves and fishes, all of them protesting with the same sincerity as Andy himself that they do not want any office. The nomination of Major-General McClellan by the Peace party was not a greater outrage on decency and common sense, and we expect to assist the honest masses in detecting the fraud, by challenging all Johnsonians as well as other Republicans to public discussion.

Resolved, That the occurrence of such loathsome proceedings as have disgraced American annals since the suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus*, the test oaths, the sittings of military commissions, and the silencing of the courts, and the forcible interference with elections, and the deposition of State officers by the present and the late President, as illustrated by such cases as those of Mrs. Surratt, Bowles, Milligan, and Horsey, Raphael Semmes, and dozens of imprisoned clergy for preaching to their flocks, are emphatically denounced, and should be resented by every freeman, as a direct attack upon all the sanctions of individual liberty, as well as the sovereignty of the States.

Resolved, That Ireland has our heartiest sympathy, in her struggle to re-

store the sovereignty of her oppressed people, and that Irishmen have no place but in our party; that the war in Germany will be a fruitless sacrifice of the people, unless their sovereignty is established on the destruction of every throne. Let the Germans among us begin to understand that they are now co-operating with the men in America who wish well to the crowned heads of Europe.

Resolved, That the cruel treatment of Jefferson Davis, is unworthy of our age and people, and that the West is not less indignant at it than the South, and that we demand his immediate trial for treason on the merits of the question whether any sovereign State has not the right which we claim for Ohio to secede from any Union threatening her existence. We want to know whether all parties will deny a doctrine common to them all from Jefferson and Calhoun to Chase and Greeley, so that history and posterity may get the truth at last.

Resolved, That we will seek by our canvass and its teachings to establish the supremacy and welfare of the white race, and against degrading it in either civil or military matters by any social or political mixture with the blacks.

Resolved, That we commend our ticket to the voters. The Democracy cannot succeed in the election, but we have the same chance of success as the Johnson-Morgan war and consolidation wing of the party. Our generous young men can support these principles and the representative men who are nominated with a conscious pride that they have deserved well of the republic by doing their duty at the polls.

The above resolutions are bolder and more outspoken than those of the First-of-May Duvall Convention, but we do not believe there is a Duvallite in Kentucky who does not *from his heart* indorse *every one* of them, and that *policy* ALONE keeps the Duvall radical papers in this State and the Duvall Secession speakers from practicing doctrines as radical and unblushing as those which are contained in the above Secession Platform of the Radical Democracy of Ohio.

The Secession Radicals of Kentucky are as much opposed, we firmly believe, to Andrew Johnson and his policy as they are to Congress; but they think Johnsonism more *popular* in Kentucky than the majority of Congress, and so for the time being the Secession Radicals *affect* to support, in a sort of milk-and-water, indefinite way, the President. Let Secession be everywhere triumphant at the polls—of which, fortunately, there is no danger—and we should soon learn the peculiar character of the “support” the Secession Radicals of Kentucky would give him. They hate him as the devil does holiness! Their Ohio friends, who have no *hope* even of any success, speak out and denounce *Johnson* as heartily as they do Congress.

The gleam of the serpent runs through every plank and joint, over the seats and through the posts of the Secession platform of Ohio, and his hiss may be heard, though less distinctly, from the Duvall Convention. Beware of the old snake, fellow-citizens. Crush him!

The Radicals in Indiana and Kentucky are calling themselves Unionists.
—*Courier*.

That's more than you do. You and your Radical party do not even “call”

yourselves Unionists. You are perpetually denouncing men for calling themselves so. Your Radicals never professed even—except for the purpose of deceiving people preceding an election, as they did in 1860—to the Unionists. However much impudence they may have, they haven't quite enough for that. They have been fighting the Union for many years, and the leaven of disunion is still working in them. It seems to be a part of them.

~~General~~ General Buckner undertook to capture Louisville, and the Louisville-Bowling-Green-Courier ardently desired his success. If he had taken our city, it would, according to the policy recommended by the Louisville-Bowling-Green-Courier, have been abandoned only as a wide waste of ashes and cinders. Every citizen, who has a house over his head, may bear in mind, if he chooses, that he enjoys the blessing in defiance of the Courier's most ardent wishes.

GENERAL EDWARD H. HOBSON—THE RECORD OF OUR CANDIDATE FOR CLERK OF THE COURT OF APPEALS.

The election is near at hand, and our friends throughout the State should use every effort and make every sacrifice for the success of our candidate. We have placed a man on the track who is among those of whom Kentucky may well be proud. His record is pure and spotless, and his high qualities have been proven in varied and trying positions. He is a true type of the Kentucky gentleman, and every pulsation of his breast is for his country and the honor of his country's institutions.

General Edward H. Hobson is a citizen of Greensburg, Green county, Ky., where he was raised. He is from a family of unblemished character, which has long been identified with the records of the State. He did business in Greensburg until the war with Mexico. He served in that war as Captain under Colonel Henry Clay with distinguished gallantry. At the sanguinary battle of Buena Vista, he met the Mexicans face to face in fight, and when the battle was raging at its fiercest, and almost at the muzzles of his enemies' weapons, he ordered his men to clean their guns, which was done with the utmost coolness, under immediate fire, and the foe was hurled back in disorder. This was pronounced at the time to be one of the coolest and most daring examples of bravery on record. After the war he continued business in Greensburg till the secession troubles of 1860-61. In his part of the State there was a strong secession element at work. There was in the town of Greensburg a branch of the Bank of Kentucky, with a large amount of funds. General Hobson was President of the Bank, and, being loyal to the core, at great personal risk, boldly took the responsibility of removing the funds of the Bank to Louisville, thus early showing his solicitude

in the interests of the institutions of his State. When actual hostilities commenced in the late war of treason against the Government, General Hobson raised the 13th regiment of Kentucky Infantry. At the head of this regiment he served with efficiency through the most arduous campaigns of the war, plunging himself heroically into the furnace of the fiercest fights. At Shiloh, at Corinth, and Perryville, and all through the campaigns of Buell and Rosecranz, he was at the front of the front.

In December, 1862, just before the battle of Stone River, he and his regiment was sent from Silver Springs, Tennessee, to Munfordville, Kentucky, where he had charge of the fortifications and the responsible duty of protecting the railroad communication against Morgan and other rebel depredators. While in the performance of this delicate duty he was promoted to the rank of Brigadier-General without solicitation on his part, his highest ambition being the pride of being useful to his country in time of need. After his promotion he pursued Morgan, who crossed the Ohio River at Brandenburg with his troopers, through Indiana and Ohio, and was chiefly instrumental in the capture of that daring rebel partisan. He also fought Morgan at Cynthiana with greatly inferior numbers, and acquitted himself with his usual bravery and daring.

During the latter part of the war Hobson was stationed at Lexington as District Commander, and fired one hundred guns in front of the old Transylvania University in honor of the event of General Lee's surrender. Since the war, he has been engaged in business at Lebanon, Kentucky, where he is well known and universally esteemed. As a citizen, as a soldier, as a patriot, and as a man, he stands like Chevalier Bayard, without fear and without reproach.

In politics, General Hobson has always been an Old Line Democrat, and thoroughly consistent. He voted for Mr. Douglas in 1860, and has sustained the Union Conservatives ever since. He did not vote for the Constitutional amendment, though favoring the measure, his services being at the time engaged in fighting the enemies of his country.

Such is the patriot whom Kentuckians intend to reward by an election to the Clerkship of the Court of Appeals. Let there be vigorous and united action to secure his election, and let there be enthusiasm where each "lends the strength of his good right arm in so righteous a cause."

THE DUVALL SECESSION PARTY OF KENTUCKY HAS NOTHING IN COMMON WITH THE UNION DEMOCRACY OF INDIANA OR OF ANY OTHER NORTHERN STATE.

The leaders of the Radical Duvall Democracy hope to deceive a few ignorant persons in Kentucky by pretending that they and their Secession Party constitute the "Democracy of Kentucky." The assumption is a fraud upon popular intelligence, and can deceive nobody but the very ignorant. The

true Democracy of the country is a Union Democracy, whereas the Duvall party is simply a secession faction under a false name. That clique is stealing the livery of Union to serve secession in.

In proof of the truth of our position we present to the voters of Kentucky facts which cannot be gainsaid, which defy contradiction. Elsewhere in this Extra Journal we have examined a portion of the platform adopted by the First of May Convention and we have there proved conclusively and irrefragably that that body studiously avoided condemning the PRINCIPLES OF SECESSION, but that it did, on the contrary, really RE-AFFIRM that doctrine though in so sly and concealed a way as not to attract that public attention which it deserves and ought to receive. Upon this point we refer our readers to a long review of the issue in the present pamphlet, entitled "UNION VERSUS SECESSION."

Now, for the proof of the statement that the Union Democracy of Indiana expressly REPUDIATE SECESSION, we ask the attention of the public to the following resolutions of the Indiana Democracy assembled at New Albany in the early part of this month. We give the first eleven resolutions adopted, *seriatim*. The convention was addressed by the Hon. Daniel W. Voorhees and Hon. John McDonald, who cordially indorsed the resolutions. Indeed, we presume they were written by Mr. Voorhees himself. Read and see for yourselves the proof that the Union Democracy of Indiana denounce, deny, and utterly repudiate SECESSION in the very first resolve they made:

The Democratic party and its conservative friends of the Second Congressional District of Indiana, in delegate convention assembled, declare:

1. THAT THE PRESERVATION OF THE UNION OF THE STATES, UNDER THE GUARANTEES OF A WRITTEN CONSTITUTION, IS THE FIRST AND HIGHEST DUTY OF THE CITIZEN, AND THAT IN TIMES PAST, IN THE PRESENT, AND IN THE FUTURE, IT HAS BEEN, IS, AND MUST BE THE TEST OF POLITICAL ORTHODOXY-

2. That the late war, on the part of the authorities and Government of the United States, BECAME JUST AND NECESSARY TO SAVE THE UNION FROM DISRUPTION AND THE CONSTITUTION FROM OVERTHROW, and now that, by the valor and heroism of our soldiers and sailors, it has been, so far as their action is concerned, brought to a glorious and successful conclusion, the Democratic party insists that the objects for which the war was begun and prosecuted shall be carried out in good faith by our civil rulers; that the Union of the States shall in fact as well as in name be restored, and the supremacy of the Constitution shall everywhere be established.

3. That, as the Democracy of the Second District were among the first to respond to the call of the constituted authorities for troops when the Union was in danger, so we now recognize the services of the soldiers and sailors who aided in the suppression of the rebellion, and hereby tender to them our thanks and gratitude for the part they took in the great struggle. We further declare it to be the duty of Congress to do justice to the soldiers by equalizing their bounties, and to provide ample pensions for those who have been maimed in the service of their country, and to the widows and orphans of those who have been killed.

4. That it is the exclusive province of the States to determine, each for itself, the qualification of voters, without any interference whatever from any department of the General Government; but that, speaking in behalf of the Democracy of the Second Congressional District of Indiana, we hereby declare our uncompromising hostility to the conferring of the right of suffrage upon the negroes.

5. That the Democracy of the Second District indorse and uphold the messages of President Johnson vetoing the Freedmen's Bureau and Civil Rights bills, believing that the principles enunciated in said messages are correct and proper, and should be sustained by the people.

6. That if any portion of the population are to be fed, clothed, and educated by the General Government, we prefer that it shall be the widows and orphans of our own soldiers, instead of the blacks of the South.

7. That the efforts now being made in Congress, at the instigation of Eastern manufacturers, to increase the rates of duties levied by the already oppressive tariff, whereby the cost of almost every article of domestic consumption will be largely enhanced, without the revenue of the Government being increased, is an act of gross injustice to the people of the West, and calls for the severest condemnation.

8. That, disregarding all former differences, we invite to our standard all men of conservative views, who believe with us that the time has come when an earnest and patriotic effort should be made to restore the Union on a just and equal basis, and that the messages and speeches of President Johnson point out the safest and most certain mode of attaining that desirable object.

9. That the restoration policy of President Johnson, and his gallant defense of the same, excites and receives our warmest approval and highest admiration; and that we pledge to him and to the country our best efforts to continue in Congress from this district an open, bold, and manly defender and supporter of that policy.

10. That we are opposed to any amendment to the Constitution of the United States at the present time, because, in the language of President Johnson, "a proper appreciation of the letter and spirit of the Constitution, as well as of the interest of national order, harmony, and union, and a deference for an enlightened public judgment, may at this time well suggest a doubt whether any amendment to the Constitution ought to be proposed by Congress and pressed on the Legislatures of the several States for their final decision until after the admission of such Senators and Representatives of the non-represented States as have been or may hereafter be chosen in conformity with the Constitution and laws of the United States."

11. We declare our conviction that none of the States lately in rebellion were out of the Union at any time during the war, though their practical relations were temporarily suspended while armies met in hostile array. The pen of Gen. Sherman, like his sword, was pointed in the right direction when

he addressed himself to the Georgia Commissioners in 1864, and said: "Georgia is not out of the Union, and therefore the talk of reconstruction appears to be inapplicable. My opinion is that no negotiations are necessary, nor commissions, nor conventions, nor anything of the kind. Whenever the people of Georgia quit rebelling against their Government, then the State of Georgia will have resumed her functions in the Union."

How different is the language of these resolutions from those adopted by the First of May Secession Convention! That body said not one word in opposition to SECESSION. It did *not* declare that the "preservation of the Union is the FIRST and HIGHEST duty of the citizen;" it did *not* say that this one *was* the "first and highest duty of the citizen, or that it is so now or that it ever will be so. That Duvall Convention did *not* declare that the late war on the part of the Government and authorities of the United States BECAME JUST and NECESSARY TO SAVE THE UNION FROM DISRUPTION AND THE CONSTITUTION FROM OVERTHROW. That body was composed of secessionists who have been for years affirming, directly or indirectly, JUST THE CONTRARY. They had denounced the war for the salvation of the UNION *and the* CONSTITUTION in unmeasured terms of obloquy. They had exhausted the language of anathema, they had applied every epithet of denunciation to that war for the Union which they could find in the dictionary or their fertile imaginations could invent! There is nothing in common, we repeat, between the Duvall Secession Radicals of Kentucky and the Union Democracy of Indiana or the Union Democracy of any other State. They are as wide asunder as the poles, as different as China is from America, as unlike as the late Richmond oligarchy and the Union of these States, as unlike as the good angels who never fell are unlike Satan the fallen Devil.

A LETTER FROM THE FRIEND AND COMPANION OF HENRY CLAY AND JOHN J. CRITTENDEN, THE VENERABLE EX SENATOR J. R. UNDERWOOD—KENTUCKIANS, READ AND THINK FOR YOURSELVES.

Read the following letter from Judge Underwood, and then ask yourselves what would be the political effect upon the minds of the whole North of the election next month in Kentucky of Alvin Duvall.

Hon. J. R. Underwood, long one of Kentucky's most patriotic and bril-

liant representatives, the friend and associate of Clay, of Crittenden, of Webster, and all those other illustrious defenders of the Union and the Constitution who adorned the councils of the nation in the palmy and glorious days of the Republic, has written a long and able letter in opposition to the present effort of Secessionists to revive a Secession party in Kentucky, and in favor of the UNION PRINCIPLES of General Hobson and those who support him, from which we make the following extracts:

When the people of our State were, with a unanimity of sentiment and opinion unprecedented, freely exchanging their views and ideas; resolved to aid President Johnson to the extent of their powers in his patriotic policy; receiving the returning Confederate soldiers as the father receives his prodigal son, and holding counsel among themselves how they could best obtain assistance from their Northern fellow-citizens (without whose aid we are powerless) to secure a constitutional Government in all time to come, which shall secure the protection of property and the blessings of life and liberty to ourselves and posterity; while the people of the State were thus intensely and anxiously employing their thoughts on matters of the greatest importance to every citizen, a convention of gentlemen assembled in Louisville, on the first of May last, and nominated Judge Duvall as a candidate for the Clerkship of the Court of Appeals. This was done after a very large majority of the Conservative members of the Legislature had in caucus, "resolved that, in our judgment, there is now no necessity for a call of a convention, and we would respectfully urge the party not to call a convention when no necessity exists for the same."

This resolution was heartily approved by thousands, who believe that it requires no great amount of mental ability to qualify a person for the Clerkship of the Court of Appeals, and that an honest man, capable of discharging the duties of a Circuit Court Clerk with credit, may also perform equally well the duties of the Clerk of the Court of Appeals. Many of those with whom I have politically acted for years thought there was great danger in calling a convention of breaking up the harmony and unity of purpose which everywhere manifested itself among the people. We thought it wise to allow as many candidates as chose to present themselves to enter the track and run the race upon their individual merit, uninfluenced by party considerations. In town and county meetings the people had very generally approved the policy of President Johnson before the May Convention assembled in Louisville. Under these circumstances it seemed to me that nothing but mischief would result from a convention to nominate a party candidate for the Clerkship of the Appellate Court.

The convention was held and Judge Duvall nominated; and as soon as it was done, the inquiry arose, WHAT POLITICAL PRINCIPLES ARE TO

BE MANIFESTED BY VOTING FOR HIM? In case of his election as a mere clerk and recorder of the proceedings of the court, he will have in his official capacity nothing whatever to do with politics. It is, therefore, most pertinently asked, is there any common principle or principles which bind his supporters together, and which they intend to proclaim as having received the sanction of the people of Kentucky by his election, and what are these principles? It is equally pertinent to ask if the election of Judge Duvall is to be taken as the triumph of a political creed of a certain character, WHAT IMPRESSION WILL SUCH A TRIUMPH IN KENTUCKY MAKE UPON THE PEOPLE OF THE NORTHERN STATES IN THEIR FUTURE POLITICAL ACTION UPON THE GREAT QUESTIONS OF VITAL INTEREST TO THE SOUTH, WHICH MUST BE DECIDED WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF AVOIDING THEM?

As to the first of these questions, it cannot be denied that those who believe in the right of a State to secede from the Union, and those who were opposed to suppressing the rebellion by military force, and those who, after the war had commenced, were in favor of paralyzing the operations of the Government in carrying it on by refusing supplies of men and money, are GENERALLY, if not UNANIMOUSLY, the SUPPORTERS OF JUDGE DUVAL. Add to these many of those who have been deprived of their slave property by, as they believe, the unconstitutional and revolutionary action and proceedings of the Government and people of the North, and who were originally Union-loving men, and we have the party which has brought forward and supported Judge Duvall—A PARTY, IN MY JUDGMENT, COMPOSED MAINLY, IF NOT ENTIRELY, OF THOSE WHO FAVOR SECESSION AS A RIGHT, WHO OPPOSE COERCION, AND WHO, IN SENTIMENT ARE ULTRA PRO-SLAVERY. IT SEEMS TO ME, THEREFORE, THAT JUDGE DUVAL HAS BEEN PUT FORTH BY HIS PARTY AS THEIR CANDIDATE TO REPRESENT THESE, THEIR PRINCIPLES, IN THE PENDING ELECTION, AND THAT GENERAL HOBSON HAS BEEN BROUGHT FORWARD TO REPRESENT THE OPPOSITE.

As I believe that the permanent welfare and happiness of the United States, North and South, will be best secured and promoted by the free trade and intercourse guaranteed by one National Government over the whole territory, I can never consent to have it broken up into two or more separate and rival, if not hostile, governments. As I believe that no State has a right, peaceably, to secede from the Union, and that those who attempt it, and engage in war to accomplish it, may be coerced and punished as traitors, and as I am not *pro-slavery* in my sentiments and opinions, although I do not approve the mode by which the slaves have been emancipated, I find that I am in a position radically opposed to the fundamental principles which I believe have animated and induced the members of the May convention in Louisville to present Judge Duvall as their representative and candidate, and hence I

cannot *consistently* co-operate with them to aid in his election. It would, it seems to me, be giving my sanction and approval of principles to which I have always been opposed. It is for those who thought as I did when the rebellion commenced, to take care of their *consistency*. I have seen many things done in the progress of the war which I utterly condemned as unconstitutional, and but for which I believe the war would have been terminated and *harmony restored* much sooner than it is now likely to be. But these unconstitutional actions and usurpations of the Government and its military commanders have nothing to do with the principles for which the Union party contended prior to the rebellion. The sad effect now seen by every eye, as the palpable result of the violation of the Constitution by mad politicians, demonstrate the value of those principles for which the true patriots and Union men contended before the blood of the rebellion began to flow. The present duty of every citizen is to use his influence to get back to a government of fixed constitutional principles, to adjust all difficulties and to redress all wrongs growing out of the war, and to induce our wide-spread population to seek prosperity and happiness by engaging in the various pursuits and employments of life by which a comfortable living can be procured without doing injustice. The business of agriculture, of manufacture and commerce, the great sources of human comfort, flourishes most in peace and decays in war. Can we get back to fixed constitutional principles so long as there is a strong party in the political arena, fighting for the principle of secession, fighting against the principle of coercion to put down rebellion, and fighting still against the annihilation of African slavery?

It may be said that the party which has selected Judge Duvall as their standard-bearer has not inscribed any one of these purposes upon their flag; BUT THEY HAVE NOT NEGATIVED THE RECOGNITION BY THEM OF THE PRESENT EXISTENCE OF SUCH SENTIMENTS AND OPINIONS IN THEIR HEARTS; NOR HAVE THEY AVOWED ANY INTENTION TO ABANDON THEIR FORMER SENTIMENTS AND OPINIONS ON THESE POINTS. THEIR ANTECEDENTS CONSIDERED, IT SEEMS TO ME THEY OUGHT NOT TO HAVE REMAINED SILENT UPON THESE IMPORTANT POINTS IN PRESENTING THEIR PLATFORM FOR PUBLIC EXAMINATION.

Now, suppose Judge Duvall should be elected, when his supporters are not committed by any public declaration of the convention which nominated him, against the doctrine of secession, or against future efforts to enslave the African race, or in favor of putting down future rebellions by coercion; it is my opinion that his supporters would have just ground for claiming that his election was the triumph of their principles long entertained in respect to secession, coercion, and slavery. It would naturally follow that they would insist that the Union sentiment of Kentucky had given way, and that henceforth our State would take a new position contrary to that she had heretofore

maintained, and that she would now fight for secession and separation as bravely as she had fought against them.

I am convinced that the election of Judge Duvall WOULD BE HERALDED AS THE TRIUMPH OF PRINCIPLES WHICH CAN NEVER AGAIN PREVAIL IN THIS COUNTRY UNLESS THEY ARE ESTABLISHED BY REVOLUTION AND WAR—A WAR WHICH, IN EVERY RESPECT, WOULD BE MORE SAVAGE AND HORRIBLE, AND MORE DAMAGING TO THE CAUSE OF CIVILIZATION AND HUMANITY, THAN ANYTHING WHICH HAS OCCURRED DURING THE FOUR YEARS OF CARNAGE THROUGH WHICH WE HAVE SO RECENTLY PASSED.

Let me now, in the second place, consider the effects likely to be produced in the minds and actions of the people of the Northern States in case Judge Duvall and his supporters should triumph. Suppose a Kentuckian should, after the election, meet with and say to a voter of Massachusetts: "I am anxious that the next election of members of Congress may change the character of that body, and that, instead of the *Radical* majority which now legislates for the nation, we may have a wise and liberal representation from all sections and States, who will go to work and do justice by redressing the injuries which thousands have suffered, without wrong on their part, from the action of the Government and its officers. I purchased a plantation and a hundred slaves upon a credit of ten years, contracting to pay interest annually and the principal at the end of the credit. The slaves in the contract were valued at fifty thousand dollars. The slaves have been emancipated, and, by the loss of their labor, the plantation is unproductive, and I have not been able to pay the interest, and see no possibility of paying the principal when it becomes due. I was arrested and sent to Louisville, and there imprisoned, and paid two hundred dollars to a lawyer to get me out, and never knew what I was arrested and imprisoned for, nor what kind of management the lawyer adopted to get me out. A military officer ordered me to pay four hundred dollars—part of a fund raised by coercion—to remunerate, as he said, a *loyal* citizen for the loss of his dwelling-house—burnt by the rebels. You Northern people own most of the public debt, and the people of my State are heavily taxed to pay the interest, which goes into the pockets of your people, and, while we are paying taxes under what we call the 'equalization law,' upon the debts due us, you are paying nothing upon the debts due you by the General Government; and you are about to amend the Constitution again so that you can demand the last cent, with interest, upon your Government bond, although you paid for it in *greenbacks* when they were worth only half their nominal amount in gold and silver. By emancipating our slaves, hereafter direct taxes under the Constitution will be imposed upon us in proportion to our numbers, counting the emancipated negroes (the whole of them, and not three-fifths, as heretofore) in ascertaining

our taxable numbers. These emancipated slaves have no property, and are not likely to accumulate any—and hence the burden must fall much heavier upon the white population.

“Hard as this operates upon us, the present Congress has recommended another amendment of the Constitution for the adoption of the States, by which, if adopted, unless we allow free male negroes over twenty-one years of age to vote, the basis of representation in Congress is changed so as to diminish the representative strength of Kentucky, while the basis of direct taxation is retained and made as large as possible. In addition to these evils, a national banking system has been invented and put into operation, by which you Northern people almost exclusively make profit to yourselves by issuing a depreciated currency based upon your Government securities. In all these matters eleven Southern States have no voice, being excluded from representation in Congress. Now, my Yankee friend, all these things must be brought in time to the consideration of Congress and to the consideration of the people in electing members to Congress, and I am very desirous that you and all Northern people should give the South your assistance by electing a President and Congressmen who will make some compensation to those who have suffered as I have, or if that cannot be done, then to take such measures as will prevent the return of such evils in future. Is there not justice in my complaint, and will you not use your political influence in behalf of such persons as I am?”

It is said that a Yankee was never known to answer a question before he put a dozen questions to the interrogator, and got answers to them all. We can readily imagine a reply to the Kentuckian to this effect:

“Before I make any promises or answer I wish to know, Do you believe in the right of secession, and did you give any aid or assistance to the rebellion? Did you think it was wrong to vote supplies and to furnish men and money to conquer the rebellion? Do you believe that cotton is king, and that a white man has a divine right to enslave the black man to make cotton? Do you believe it would be best for the people of the United States to break up their Union and to establish two or more independent National Governments? If you want to break up and divide the old territory, how do you want to run the new lines? How would you cut the valley of the Mississippi? Would you make rivers or lines of latitude your new boundary of separate nations? If I don't use my political influence in behalf of such persons as you are, and if the majority of the Northern people should refuse to assist you by electing a President and Congress to suit your purposes, what will you do then? Will you engage in another rebellion and strike for Southern independence? If you were to succeed in establishing a Southern independent Confederacy, in that event would you reopen the African slave trade, and reduce to slavery again all the negroes recently emancipated, who might fall under your power? If a new South-

ern Confederacy should arise from the ashes of the dead rebellion, are you in favor of assuming payment of the debts of the extinct Southern Confederacy? *Did you vote for Duvall?*"

The manly and frank Kentuckian, always ready to answer and give the reasons for his opinions, would probably say: "I will answer your last question first; I did vote for Duvall, but—" At this point in the colloquy, it seems to me, the Yankee would naturally, from his education, prepossessions, or prejudices, if you please to call them so, interrupt the Kentuckian by declaring: "Friend, you need not go into the '*buts*.' I *guess* it is useless for us to prolong the conversation. I perceive we shall radically differ, and at present am not disposed to enter into any engagements with you."

If the answer had been, "I voted for Hobson," it seems to me that naturally the Yankee would be disposed to say: "You are a true Union man, and upon that we agree cordially. Go on, and I will hear you upon all the matters of which you complain."

Men in every age of the world have acted in politics, in religion, in everything else, upon their convictions of what it is best for them to do under existing circumstances. This is the rule, even while they are conscious of being engaged in the act of perpetrating a great crime. Napoleon the Great sacrificed the Duke D'Enghien under the influence of circumstances, and the greater Washington broke faith and refused to carry out the treaty with France, upon the ground that existing circumstances made his course the least of two evils for his country.

In my judgment the nation has not yet had time since the close of the war to settle down upon any well-matured course of policy. The members of Congress now in office were generally elected before hostilities ceased. Their constituents may have very different convictions from them as to the proper mode of closing up the troubles and evils growing out of a rebellion which is past. The change in circumstances after civil war ends leads to new thoughts, new and different convictions from those which prevailed while the war was in progress. The white population of the late Confederate States is only about one-fifth part of the white population of the whole United States. It is, therefore, perfectly manifest that no change in the condition of the Confederate States for the better can be made unless it be brought about by a corresponding change in the sentiments and opinions of Northern people, or by revolution and war. I believe it is utterly impracticable to obtain by war those rights and privileges which, I think, ought to be conceded to them by the North. We must, therefore, take of necessity the peaceful course of appealing to the reason of the Northern people to change their present convictions if they are truly represented by their members in Congress. This can best be done by the original friends of the Union, by those who are willing to acquiesce in the abolition of slavery and who are determined never to consent to the formation of two or more new governments by the destruction of

the republic. If it cannot be done by the influence of such as these, co-operating with the Northern Democratic party, I fear it will never be done.

Entertaining these opinions, and considering the injudicious and ill-timed manner in which a political match-race has been gotten up, giving rise to passionate excitements, when calm reasoning with the people of the North was alone competent to do any good, I have determined for myself, should I get to the polls, to vote for General E. H. Hobson.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

J. R. UNDERWOOD.

Messrs. Thos. E. Bramlette, John M. Harlan, Jno. G. Vanwinkle, John Mason Brown, G. W. Monroe.

A RADICAL SECESSION EDITOR OF KENTUCKY PREFERS JEFF DAVIS TO ANDREW JOHNSON FOR PRESIDENT.

We find the following in the Frankfort Commonwealth of the 10th inst. It shows that one of the editors of the Yeoman, which is in the support of Judge Duvall, boasts of having not a "drop of loyal blood in his veins," and would vote for Jeff. Davis in preference to Andrew Johnson:

FRANKFORT, KY., July 2, 1866.

To the Editors of the Frankfort Commonwealth:

SIR: In a conversation which took place a few days since between a citizen of Lexington (but whose interests are identified with Frankfort) and a gentleman representing himself to be one of the editors of the Frankfort Yeoman, the following question was propounded to the editor: "Sir, if Andrew Johnson and Jeff Davis were candidates for the Presidency, for whom would you vote?" He replied, "I would vote for Jeff Davis; thank God, I have never since the commencement of the war had one drop of *loyal* blood in my veins."

The Yeoman, I believe, pretends to support Andrew Johnson.

If desired, the editor's name will be given; also the name of the gentleman to whom the remark was made.

A GROSS AND MOST DISREPUTABLE SWINDLE.

An electioneering pamphlet, containing an Address of the Duvall Central Committee and other documents, the whole issued by that Committee or under its auspices, has just made its appearance. One of the documents gives what purports to be a list of the names of prominent Kentuckians supporting Duvall. In regard to the positions of most of the persons named we

know nothing. We know, however, that the positions of some of them, and we presume many, are misrepresented. And we don't believe for a moment that they are *honestly* misrepresented.

General T. T. Garrard is set down as being for Duvall—he is for Hobson. the Hon. Garrett Davis is set down for Duvall—Mr. Davis said to one of the most respectable men in Kentucky, just arrived here from Washington, that he hasn't said a word upon that subject, and that no man in this State knows what his position is. The Hon. James Guthrie is set down for Duvall—he told the gentleman we have referred to that he is decidedly for Hobson. The Hon. B. C. Ritter and the Hon. H. C. Grider are set down for Duvall—both declared themselves to the same gentleman to be for Hobson. The Hon. Joshua F. Bell is set down for Duvall—he is neither for Duvall nor Hobson. The Hon. George A. Caldwell and Isaac Caldwell are set down for Duvall—we are assured by a distinguished citizen who knows them well that they take neither side in the canvass.

Such recklessness and want of principle as the getters-up of this pamphlet exhibit is disgraceful to the last degree. They evidently don't care what names they use or how they use them if they can thereby do anything for their desperate cause. They don't recognize any political deed whatever as a crime if they think they can, by committing it, gain a political advantage. They will, without inquiry, and even with a full knowledge that they are practicing deception, attribute opinions to men who hold such opinions in abhorrence. They are falsifiers, libelers, slanderers, aspersers, vilifiers, calumniators. Accept not a single word they say.

WHY SECESSIONISTS SUPPORT DUVALL—EXTRAORDINARY SCENE AT ELIZABETHTOWN.

The Hon. John M. Harlan and General Crittenden had an appointment to speak at Elizabethtown, always reputed to be a secession and rebel den, on Monday. General Crittenden was unable to attend, and Hamilton Pope, Esq., of Louisville, accompanied Mr. Harlan. The meeting was a very large one, although the pro-rebels, in order to draw off as many of their friends as they could, held a meeting at the same time at the Court-house to nominate candidates for the county offices and for other purposes.

Mr. Pope spoke about an hour. His speech is represented to have been a

most admirable one, making a strong and deep impression upon the audience. We are told that it was exactly the kind of speech most needed. Mr. P. had to endure some interruptions from the pro-rebels in the crowd, yet, on the whole, his eloquent remarks were well and courteously received. Mr. Harlan followed in a speech of two hours and a half, speaking as very few men are able to speak. In the midst of his strongest and most eloquent utterances, loud cries were raised of "Hurrah for Duvall!" Mr. Harlan paused and asked mildly but impressively why they were for Duvall. "Tell me," said he, "if it is not because he was for the rebellion." "Yes, that's so," was the prompt answer. "Then *you* were for the rebellion." "Yes, yes, yes!" "Are you for rebellion now?" "We would go for rebellion now if we thought we could succeed." Mr. Harlan thanked and complimented them for their candor, and then added: "Suppose Jeff Davis and Andrew Johnson shall be the opposing candidates for the Presidency in 1868—which of the two will you support?" They hesitated to respond. Mr. H. said, "you have been very candid, and I venture to hope that you will still be so. Speak out! Which will you go for—Johnson or Davis?" Then the loud answer came, "Davis! Davis! Davis!" Old men, the most substantial citizens of Elizabethtown and Hardin, joined in the shout. Again, Mr. Harlan thanked them for their candor, telling them that they were the most candid men of their party that he had talked to in all his canvass.

Very shortly afterward, Mr. Harlan not having concluded his remarks, the pro-rebel portion of the audience made a rush toward the stand and shouted, "Wilson! Wilson! Wilson!" this Wilson being a pro-rebel lawyer of Elizabethtown. A Union officer or soldier present exclaimed, "I have heard that same character of shout before. I heard it raised more than once in the rebel army. It is exactly the kind of shout with which the rebel troops always went into battle." Mr. Wilson ascended the stand. Mr. Sam. Thomas rose and objected to his making a speech. "This," he said calmly and resolutely, "is our meeting. We would willingly have divided time with you if you had asked us to do so, but you did not, and we have made our own arrangements, which must not be broken up or disturbed."

The pro-rebels then proposed that all who wished to hear Mr. Wilson should go to the Court-house. About one-third went. Mr. W. saw that the movement was a failure, and, we understand, declined making a speech.

Mr. Thomas followed Mr. Harlan, and spoke with fine effect for an hour. He is a gentleman of strong sense and great popularity, and his speech did much good. The pro-rebels have been reckoning upon a majority of hundreds in Hardin, but our friends are now confident of being able to carry the county. At the close of the meeting, several prominent citizens, long known as rebel sympathizers, said that they couldn't and wouldn't stand it any longer—that they would vote for Hobson against Duvall.

THE INDIANA DEMOCRATS DESIRE THE ELECTION OF HOBSON—
THE LOYAL DEMOCRACY OF THE NORTH REPUDIATE THE SE-
CESSION DEMOCRACY OF KENTUCKY LETTER FROM AN INDI-
ANA DEMOCRAT—UNION DEMOCRATS, READ.

George W. Shanklin, a talented young Democratic lawyer of Evansville, Indiana, on a late visit to his relatives at Frankfort, Ky., being a brother-in-law to Attorney-General John M. Harlan, was invited by a large committee of Union citizens to address them at the Court-house on the political issues of the day, and on declining the invitation wrote the following patriotic letter in favor of the election of General Hobson, which we are authorized to publish.

We feel assured that this noble letter of Mr. Shanklin expresses the real sentiments of every loyal Democrat in Indiana and in the North.

The Northern Democracy have no sympathy whatever with the Courier's efforts to reorganize the secession party in Kentucky. On the contrary, they repudiate all such efforts as in the last degree mischievous, and calculated to retard the great work of reconciliation which patriots have begun:

FRANKFORT, Ky., July 4, 1866.

Messrs. Governor Bramlette, J. S. Van Winkle, S. C. Bull, John L. Scott, John B. Temple, and others:

GENTLEMEN: Your very complimentary invitation to address the conservative Union citizens of Frankfort to-morrow night has just been handed to me.

While I regret—owing to a severe disorder of the throat—that it will be impossible for me to comply with your request, it gives me great pleasure to state that, in common with the mass of the Democracy of Indiana, I sympathize *wholly and entirely* with the Union men of Kentucky in their struggle with the *secession* Democracy of the State, and most earnestly pray for the success of their representative, *the gallant and patriotic Hobson!*

Very respectfully,

GEO. W. SHANKLIN.

GENERAL HINDMAN AND THE COURIER.

In January, 1862, the Louisville Courier, then published at Nashville, which now aspires to lead the rebel Democracy of the State, spoke as follows of the infamous acts of Hindman, the atrocious rebel General who was then burning Cave City Hotel, Howlett's Station, and other buildings between Green river and Bowling Green :

The burning and destruction of property by General Hindman's command is the best news we have from beyond Bowling Green. Rather than the vile Yankees should have the use or benefit of them we would rather see every house in the State burned down and every foot of ground laid waste and made desolate.

Will Kentuckians vote for a man sustained by a paper uttering such sentiments as these? We trust not.

CERTAINTY OF HOBSON'S ELECTION IF UNION MEN DO THEIR DUTY.

We will demonstrate this in few words.

The Constitutional Amendment men carried the State last year by a small majority against the combined Secession and Union Democratic vote. If one county had not failed to send in its returns within the time prescribed by law, Mr. Neale, the amendment candidate, would have received the certificate of election. *Every amendment man is in favor of Hobson. Not an amendment man in the State will vote for Duvall.* Now, in addition to the vote of every Constitutional Amendment man, General Hobson will receive the whole vote of the UNION DEMOCRACY that last year opposed the amendment! This secures Hobson's election by an overwhelming majority if the Union men of Kentucky go to the polls. Can we doubt that they will? Can we think that they will play the laggard WHEN IT IS THEIR COUNTRY THAT CALLS?

The vote as officially declared stood: Garrard 42,187, Neale 42,082; majority for Garrard 105. But the vote in Whitley county, giving Neale a majority of 300, was not reported at all. If it had been, Neale would have been elected by 195 majority.

STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE UNION PARTY OF KENTUCKY.

HON. HAMILTON POPE,

GEN. J. T. BOYLE,

JOHN G. BARRETT,

COL. G. C. WHARTON,

G. P. DOERN, Esq.

At a meeting of the State Central Committee of the Union party, held on the 30th of June, 1866, General E. H. Hobson tendered his resignation as a member thereof, which was accepted, and John G. Barrett, Esq., of the city of Louisville, was elected in his place, and, on motion, the Hon. James F. Robinson, of Scott county, and Captain Stephen Jones, were added thereto.

On motion, Lieutenant-Governor Richard T. Jacob, of Oldham, and Hon. C. F. Burnham, of Madison, were appointed to canvass the State at large, and General John M. Harlan, of Franklin, Hon. J. W. Gorin, of Barren, and Colonel Frank Wolford, of Casey, were appointed assistant canvassers, and the following gentlemen were selected to canvass and organize their respective districts, with power to appoint assistants and committees for each county therein:

First District—C. T. Gray, Princeton; Hon. P. D. Yeiser, Paducah; Hon. N. R. Black, Marion, Crittenden county.

Second District—Hon. Alfred Allen, Hardinsburg; John Feland, Hopkinsville; Colonel Edward Weir, Jr., Greenville; S. D. Wing, Owensboro.

Third District—Robert Rodes, Bowling Green; Col. J. W. Craddock, Munfordville; Col. James A. Rousseau, Edmonton, Metcalfe county; Captain Carr, Albany.

Fourth District—Col. Marion Taylor, Shelbyville; Hon. W. R. Thompson, Shepherdsville; John W. Lewis, Greensburg; Hon. C. S. Hill, Lebanon; Col. W. H. Hayes, Springfield.

Fifth District—Hon. J. N. Webb, New Castle; Major Duval English, Owenton; Hon. James Harrison, Jefferson; Wm. A. Meriwether, city of Louisville.

Sixth District—Hon. Thornton F. Marshall, Augusta; Col. J. J. Landrum, Warsaw; Hon. James W. Fennill, Covington.

Seventh District—Hon. James F. Robinson, Georgetown; Hon. John B. Huston, Lexington; Col. R. M. Kelly, Paris.

Eighth District—John G. Eve, Barboursville; M. H. Owsley, Lancaster; John W. Tuttle, Monticello; M. L. Rice, Lancaster; Col. S. M. Barnes, Somerset; Wm. Webb, Irvine; Hon. Granville Pearl, Mt. Vernon.

Ninth District—John M. Burns, Catlettsburg; W. C. Ireland, Greenupsburg; Hon. Mr. Drury, Mt. Sterling; Harrison Taylor, Maysville; Col. W. J. Worthington, Greenupsburg.

HAMILTON POPE, Chairman,

G. C. WHARTON, Secretary.

UNION MEN FOR HOBSON.

Hon. J. R. Underwood,
 Governor T. E. Bramlette,
 General T. L. Crittenden,
 Colonel Charles S. Hanson,
 General W. C. Whittaker,
 Hon. James Guthrie,
 Colonel G. C. Wharton,
 Hon. Green Clay Smith,
 Hon. H. C. Grider,
 General L. H. Rousseau,
 Hon. W. H. Randall,
 W. H. Sneed, Esq.,
 George D. Prentice, Esq.,
 Hon. S. B. Thomas,
 Colonel C. D. Pennebaker,
 Hon. Geo. S. Shanklin,
 Hon. W. H. Wordsworth,
 Ex-Governor J. F. Robinson,
 Joshua F. Speed, Esq.,
 Hon. W. V. Lowry,
 M. L. Rice, Esq.,
 Hon. James J. Buckner,
 Hon. J. S. Van Winkle,
 W. S. Doak, Esq.,
 John S. Scott, Esq.,
 Colonel W. S. Rankin,
 D. R. Carr, Esq.,
 Hon. J. M. Garvin,
 Hon. O. P. Johnson,
 John G. Barrett, Esq.,
 Hon. John A. Prall,
 Hon. W. H. Granger,
 Hon. J. D. Landrum,
 Hon. Martin Bijur,
 Hon. H. G. Vanseggern,
 Dr. Wm. Ely,
 G. C. Symes, Esq.,
 Hon. W. T. Childs,
 Hon. Bland Ballard,
 Hon. J. P. Harbeson,
 Col. James T. Bramlette,

Colonel Frank Woolford,
 Lieutenant-Governor R. T. Jacobs,
 General John M. Harlan,
 General W. T. Ward,
 General T. T. Garrard,
 General J. T. Boyle,
 Hon. Hamilton Pope,
 Hon. M. C. Johnson,
 Hon. B. C. Ritter,
 Hon. R. H. Rousseau,
 Col. John M. Brown,
 J. H. Lowry, Esq.,
 General A. M. Stout,
 Col. W. P. Boone,
 T. W. Gibson, Esq.,
 Hon. James Harrison,
 Hon. T. A. Marshall,
 General John B. Huston,
 General J. W. Finnell,
 Samuel Craycraft, Esq.,
 Colonel George W. Monroe,
 Hon. P. B. Muir,
 Hon. Henry Pirtle,
 Colonel John J. Landrum,
 Colonel R. T. Baker,
 R. B. Bolling, Esq.,
 Hon. B. F. D. Guffy,
 General J. Jackson,
 Colonel W. R. Kinney,
 J. H. Harney, Esq.,
 Hon. Alfred Allen,
 Hon. T. Z. Morrow,
 Colonel B. H. Bristow,
 Hon. J. M. Armstrong,
 Hon. Urban E. Kennedy,
 Stephen Bartram, Esq.,
 George P. Doern, Esq.,
 Hon. C. S. Hill,
 Colonel A. G. Hodges,
 Col. D. R. Haggard,
 Colonel M. C. Taylor.

And a host of others, too numerous to mention, are all warmly in favor of Hobson's election.

